1	SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
2	COUNTY OF KINGS - CRIMINAL TERM - PART 29
3	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
4	-against-
5	ENRIQUE RIVERA,
6	DEFENDANT.
7	PAYTON, WADE, HUNTLEY HEARING Indict. No. 1453/05
8	320 Adams Street Brooklyn, New York
9	June 6, 2006
10	
11	BEFORE:
12	HONORABLE ROBERT J. COLLINI, Justice
13	0436166
14	APPEARANCES:
15	OFFICE OF CHARLES J. HYNES, ESQ.
16	DISTRICT ATTORNEY - KINGS COUNTY For the People
17	BY: PHYLISS CHU, ESQ. Assistant District Attorney
18	JOEL K. DRANOVE, ESQ.
19	For the Defendant 299 Broadway
20	New York, New York 10007
21	
22	JUDITH BRUSCA
23	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
24	
25	

THE CLERK: Clerk number one on the calendar, 1 indictment 1453/05, Enrique Rivera. Mr. Rivera is 3 incarcerated, produced and before the Court. 4 MR. DRANOVE: Good morning, Judge. Joel 5 Dranove for Mr. Rivera. MS. CHU: For the office of the District 6 7 Attorney Phyllis Chu. Good morning. 8 THE COURT: This case is on for hearing and 9 trial. Both parties ready? 10 MS. CHU: Yes. 11 MR. DRANOVE: Your Honor, I could not be ready 12 under the circumstances I previously outlined many months 13 ago which continue through today. 14 Just briefly, but accurately recapitulating, 15 in this case where a dozen or more witnesses were 16 interviewed and none of them put a knife in the hands of 17 my client I am striving to speak to the witnesses, but all of their identities have been deleted from all the 18 19 police reports but for one or two oversights by the 20 prosecutor, which I'll turn to. 21 Now, unfortunately Mr. Ojeda was, in fact, 22 killed, but the open question is who did it? 23 My investigator not more than two weeks ago 24 upon my requesting so and based upon my identifying from 25 police reports a witness by name and phone number,

called that witness. That witness informed my client that he was instructed by the prosecutor to speak to nobody, not just the defense attorney, but to nobody about the case. I don't know if he is speaking the truth or not when he said that to my investigator.

I know my investigator is a former federal agent, highly respected, past president of the Federal Law Enforcement Association, a colonel in the New York National Guard and not prone to exaggerate.

I don't know if I'll ever get an opportunity to speak to witnesses even if they are identified, but I would like to know who they are.

Through now I don't know who they are except for guesswork on my part and it's very limited. I don't know what the prosecution submitted to your Honor with respect to its ex-parte application that witnesses identities be concealed.

Through now I've been able to learn at least three and maybe more witnesses made statements that were recorded by audiotape. I don't have the tapes.

THE COURT: I would like you to point to some authority that shows me you should. Give me case law that says you should. I could show you case law that says you shouldn't.

MR. DRANOVE: Prosecutor turned over interview

notes of them, but not the tapes. If they want to have 1 2 it both ways --3 THE COURT: It's not a matter of both ways. It's a matter of abiding by the prescribed procedure. 5 That is what counsel has done. We are going to proceed to trial. If you have 6 7 an objection you could note it for the record. MR. DRANOVE: I'll expand on my objection. 8 9 Since these are witnesses who I believe I 10 would like to interview because whatever they said 11 indicates clearly my client did not have a knife in his 12 hands. 13 THE COURT: Counsel, is there any exculpatory 14 or Brady material you haven't handed over to counsel? 15 MS. CHU: He has pretty much -- he has 16 everything. There is no Brady material. 17 MR. DRANOVE: I ask your Honor to determine 18 that. In a case where my client is accused of stabbing 19 a gentleman, the witnesses say I didn't see a knife in 20 his hands or I saw him punch at a person or I didn't see 21 him do anything, that is not Brady material. 22 THE COURT: That is why is we are going to 23 have a trial. MR. DRANOVE: I'm entitled to know that. 24 25 THE COURT: Please don't interrupt me while

I'm speaking. I'll try my best not to interrupt you. 1 2 We will have the trial. If during the trial 3 nobody saw your client do something and there is only circumstantial evidence then that will be the situation. 5 If there is no evidence that should be easy for you. 6 MR. DRANOVE: But, your Honor, we have a right, 7 courts spoke on it in Brady, to know now the names of 8 those witnesses who I believe are exculpatory witnesses. 9 THE COURT: I just asked counsel if there are 10 any exculpatory or Brady material that hasn't been 11 handed over and she indicated to me that there is not. 12 MR. DRANOVE: I'm asking your Honor to inquire 13 of the prosecutor are there any witnesses she is aware 14 of who do not put a knife in the hands of my client at 15 the time of the altercation? I believe that is critical 16 defense evidence. 17 THE COURT: Counsel, we will see what the 18 evidence is. Obviously, you'll receive all the material 19 that you're entitled to at the time you're entitled to 20 receive it. We are going to proceed now. 21 If there is Rosario material that has to be 22 handed over prior to the hearing --23 MS. CHU: It's all been handed over. 24 THE COURT: Let's move forward. I don't mean 25 to cut you short. You have your objection. We will

move forward. My understanding is this is a Wade Huntley and Payton hearing.

MR. DRANOVE: There is a difference between Rosario and Brady material. Whatever is Rosario still doesn't identify who the people are. I'm talking about Brady material.

THE COURT: If counsel moves forward and has not handed over Brady material she is absolutely moving forward at her own peril. I cannot imagine she would. She indicated to me two moments ago there was no Brady material that has not been handed over. I know counsel for a long period of time and I know her professionalism. I know she knows what Brady material is. If she didn't hand it over I suspect there isn't any. If it comes out down the line there was and the prosecution has not handed it over intentionally and willfully now before the Court then there will be situations that have to be dealt with.

I can only assume as an officer of the court that Miss Chu has made a proper representation. We are going to move forward. I understand your concern about Brady material. Miss Chu indicated it doesn't exist. I'm not about to go on a witch-hunt to see if it does.

MR. DRANOVE: The people who are not disclosed by name, address or phone number to me who said either I

didn't see him push the person, I didn't see a knife, I 1 only saw a punch, those are exculpatory witnesses. But 2 she turns over the exculpatory report without the name 3 4 of the person so she can tell you disingenuously there 5 is no Brady material, I turned it over I can't do 6 anything with it. 7 THE COURT: I'll stop now. At this point your record has been made. I don't want to get involved in 8 9 any accusations as to disingenuosity. I'm going to 10 proceed with the assumption that both parties are acting 11 professionally. If it turns out in the future one of 12 the parties is not acting professionally there will be repercussions, serious repercussions. Let's just assume 13 for the purpose of moving forward that everything is 14 15 being done as it should be done. MR. DRANOVE: Also I'm missing four DD-5 16 17 reports. I'll take that up with Miss Chu before jury 18 selection starts. Hopefully, we could resolve it. 19 THE COURT: Anything else? 20 MR. DRANOVE: We are ready. 21 THE COURT: Thank you. Call your first 22 witness. 23 MS. CHU: The People call Detective John 24 Darino.

THE COURT: Counsel come up for a moment.

1	(Discussion held at the bench, off the		
2	record.)		
3	DETECTIVE JOHN DARINO, having been first duly		
4	sworn, testified as follows:		
5	THE COURT: State your name, shield number for		
6	the record, spell your last name.		
7	THE WITNESS: Detective Darino, D-A-R-I-N-O.		
8	THE COURT: Slowly.		
9	THE WITNESS: D-A-R-I-N-O. Shield number 186.		
10	THE CLERK: Your assignment.		
11	THE WITNESS: Investigator.		
12	THE COURT: For where?		
13	THE WITNESS: 72 Detective Squad.		
14	THE COURT: Miss Chu.		
15	MS. CHU: I may inquire; right?		
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION		
17	BY MS. CHU:		
18	Q Good morning Detective.		
19	A Good morning.		
20	Q How long have you been with the New York City		
21	Police Department?		
22	A Approximately ten years.		
23	Q You're currently assigned to the 72 Squad?		
24	A That's correct.		
25	Q Are you a Detective there?		

1	A Yes, I am.		
2	Q I just want to direct your attention to February		
3	27th of 2005. Were you working on that day?		
4	A Yes, I was.		
5	Q Did there come a time that day when you became		
6	involved		
7	THE COURT: One second. Slowly.		
8	Q Did there come a time that day when you became		
9	involved in the investigation into the death of Edgar Ojeda?		
10	THE COURT: What date are we talking about		
11	again?		
12	THE WITNESS: February 27th.		
13	THE COURT: Of when?		
14	THE WITNESS: 2005.		
15	Q Did you become involved in the investigation into		
16	the death of Edgar Ojeda?		
17	A Yes, I did.		
18	Q Where did that take place?		
19	A Confines of the 72 precinct.		
20	Q Do you know the address?		
21	A Yes, I do.		
22	Q What is it?		
23	A 314 39th Street, El Borinquen Bar.		
24	Q El Borinquen?		
25	A Bar.		

1	THE COURT: You're going to have to spell		
2	that.		
3	THE WITNESS: B-O-R-I-Q-U-E-N.		
4	Q N as in Nancy?		
5	A Correct.		
6	Q How is it that you became involved?		
7	A I was assigned the case.		
8	Q You were the case Detective?		
9	A I was the case Detective.		
10	Q About what time was it that you got brought into		
11	the case?		
12	A It was at approximately 0800 hours.		
13	Q That is when you started?		
14	A That's correct.		
15	Q Now, during the course of your investigation did		
16	there come a time when you or your colleagues spoke with		
17	witnesses who were present when Mr. Ojeda was killed?		
18	A Yes, I did.		
19	Q Were any nicknames or names given for the		
20	perpetrator?		
21	A Yes, there was.		
22	Q What were the names or nicknames given?		
23	A Kekay.		
24	Q Kekay. Based upon that information did you find		
25	out who Kekay was?		

1	A Yes, I did.		
2	Q Who was that?		
3	A Enrique Rivera.		
4	Q Did you create a photographic array with Enrique		
5	Rivera?		
6	A Yes, we did.		
7	Q When did you do that?		
8	A It was on February 27th at approximately 2110		
9	hours.		
10	THE WITNESS: Can I refresh my memory to look		
11	at the notes?		
12	THE COURT: Yes.		
13	THE WITNESS: It was on February 27th at		
14	approximately 2050 hours.		
15	Q 2050 hours is when?		
16	THE COURT: 2050 hours is what?		
17	THE WITNESS: 8:50 p.m.		
18	Q Did there come a time when you showed the array to		
19	witness number six?		
20	A Yes, I did.		
21	Q What date and time did you show this array to that		
22	witness?		
23	A February 27th at 910 hours.		
24	Q 9:10 p.m.?		
25	A P.m.		

1	Q	Where did you show this array?	
2	А	72 precinct.	
3	Q	When you showed the array to witness number six did	
4	you expla	ain to witness number six what you were going to do?	
5	A	Yes, I did.	
6	Q	What did you tell her?	
7	А	I explained to him there was going to be six	
8	individua	als, six photographs of individuals and I wanted to	
9	see if he	e recognized anybody in the photographs.	
10	Q	Anybody with you when you did this array?	
11	А	Detective Gaynor.	
12	Q	Once you showed the witness the array did the	
13	witness recognize anyone in the array?		
14	А	Yes, he did.	
15	Q	What number photograph did the witness recognize?	
16	А	Number 2.	
17	Q	Number 2. And whose photograph was in position	
18	number 2?		
19	А	Enrique Rivera.	
20	Q	Did the witness indicate to you where they	
21	recognize	ed the person from?	
22	А	Yes, he did.	
23	Q	What did he say?	
24	А	He said he recognized him as the male he saw	
25	punching	and swinging his hands at the guy who got stabbed.	

1	Q Do you have the array that you showed to witness		
2	number six with you today?		
3	A Yes, I do.		
4	Q Would you please.		
5	MS. CHU: Your Honor, if I could have that		
6	deemed marked People's 1 for identification.		
7	THE COURT: Deem it marked.		
8	MS. CHU: Your Honor, just to keep along the		
9	lines of witness number one, all the reference numbers,		
10	may I use a copy to put into evidence and you can look		
11	at the original? The copies are redacted. The original		
12	is obviously not.		
13	THE COURT: We will deem the copy marked		
14	People's 1.		
15	MS. CHU: Sorry, I didn't bring a redacted copy		
16	with me.		
17	THE COURT: Do you have a		
18	MS. CHU: I'm sorry, I didn't bring a redacted		
19	copy.		
20	THE COURT: Do you have one with you?		
21	MS. CHU: No.		
22	MR. DRANOVE: Of what?		
23	THE COURT: The photo array.		
24	Counsel, do you have a copy of the photo		
25	array?		

1	MR. DRANOVE: I believe I do. I could look
2	through it right now. The prosecutor is a couple steps
3	ahead of me. I'll take a look.
4	THE COURT: We will deem the original marked
5	as People's 1 for identification for purpose of the
6	hearing. Hand me the original. I'll use it. Counsel
7	can review his copy, if he finds it, and then he could
8	show me and I'll compare it with the original and I'll
9	see whether or not
10	MR. DRANOVE: Judge.
11	THE COURT: Otherwise we will suspend that
12	portion of the hearing until you could have your copy
13	provided.
14	MR. DRANOVE: I'm looking at a copy of an
15	original.
16	THE COURT: Why don't you hand it up.
17	MR. DRANOVE: Name crossed out and number six.
18	THE COURT: Hand it up.
19	(Handing.)
20	THE COURT: It's a terrible copy. I would hope
21	that your office could do better next time with copies,
22	but it is a copy of the original.
23	The photographs are very dark, hard to make
24	out.
25	Q Detective were any marks made on the array at the

1	time you showed it to witness number six?
2	A Yes, there was.
3	THE COURT: Do you want to move the array into
4	evidence for purpose of the hearing?
5	MS. CHU: Yes. I want to ask him a few
6	foundation questions.
7	MR. DRANOVE: May I see it?
8	THE COURT: Your copy is the same as the copy
9	the officer is looking at.
10	MR. DRANOVE: He has my copy.
11	THE COURT: He has the original. The original
12	is unredacted. I'm not going to hand it over for you to
13	look at.
14	I've looked at both items and they are the
15	same documents except for the redaction.
16	MR. DRANOVE: My copy has two redactions.
17	THE COURT: Except for the redactions.
18	MR. DRANOVE: I didn't hear the plural.
19	THE COURT: I stand corrected. Thank you
20	counsel. Continue.
21	Q Detective, I'm sorry. Did you answer me? Were any
22	notations made on the actual array at the time that the
23	array was shown to the witness?
24	A Yes, there was.
25	Q Who made those?

1	A I did and number six did those notations.		
2	Q Is there also a date and time indicated on the		
3	array?		
4	A Yes, there were.		
5	Q The one you have in front of you, is that the		
6	actual array you showed to the witness on February 27th,		
7	2005?		
8	A Yes, it is.		
9	MS. CHU: At this time I would offer that into		
10	evidence as People's number 1.		
11	THE COURT: Counsel.		
12	MR. DRANOVE: Your Honor, a request, is it		
13	possible someone can put some sticky material over what		
14	identifies the individual?		
15	MS. CHU: The witness actually has a duplicate		
16	copy of the array without signatures.		
17	THE WITNESS: Would you like that?		
18	THE COURT: Yes. For purpose of the hearing		
19	we are going to need the actual signed array as		
20	evidence.		
21	MS. CHU: I understand that.		
22	(Handing.)		
23	THE COURT: Counsel, you can step back.		
24	MS. CHU: May I continue, your Honor?		
25	THE COURT: Yes. Any objection counsel?		

1	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
2	THE COURT: Deemed marked People's 1 in	
3	evidence for purpose of the hearing.	
4	Q Detective, directing your attention to February	
5	28th of 2005. Did your office also receive informatio	n
6	regarding the whereabouts of Enrique Rivera?	
7	A Yes, I did.	
8	Q And what information did you get?	
9	A That Enrique Rivera was at 172-18 Effington Avenu	e,
10	Flushing, New York.	
11	THE COURT: How do you spell it?	
12	THE WITNESS: E-F-F-I-N-G-T-O-N Avenue.	
13	A Flushing, New York 11358.	
14	Q Based upon that information did you go to that	
15	location?	
16	A Yes, I did.	
17	Q And did you go there with anyone else?	
18	A Yes, I did.	
19	Q Who did you go with?	
20	A Detective Gaynor.	
21	Q Detective Gaynor?	
22	A Yes.	
23	Q Where is he from?	
24	A Brooklyn South Homicide Squad.	
25	Q About what time did you arrive at that location?	

A	Approximately 0420 hours.
Q	About 4:20 in the morning?
А	That's correct.
Q	Can you just describe for me the location?
А	Excuse me?
Q	Can you describe the location?
A	Sure. It was a private house.
Q	Private?
A	Private house detached.
Q	Did you knock on the door?
A	Yes, I did.
Q	Did anyone open the door?
А	Yes, they did.
Q	Did this person identify themselves to you?
A	Yes, she did.
Q	And what did she tell you her name was?
А	Patricia Glasgow.
Q	Did you identify yourself?
А	Yes, I did.
Q	What did you say?
А	I told her I was Detective Darino from the 72
Detecti	ve Squad, I was conducting an investigation, I wanted
to see	if Enrique Rivera was there.
Q	Did Miss Glasgow say anything to you?
А	Yes, she did.
	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A

1	THE COURT: I'm sorry Glasgow or Blasgow?	
2	Spell it.	
3	THE WITNESS: G-L-A-S-G-O-W.	
4	THE COURT: Counsel.	
5	Q What did she say?	
6	A She told me he is right there on the couch.	
7	Q Did you see someone on the couch?	
8	A Yes, I did.	
9	Q Can you tell me do you see that person here in the	
10	courtroom today?	
11	A Yes, I do.	
12	Q Please point him out and indicate something he is	
13	wearing.	
14	A Enrique Rivera. He is wearing the suit with the	
15	gray tie.	
16	THE COURT: Indicating the Defendant.	
17	Q Now, did you speak with Enrique Rivera?	
18	A Yes, I did.	
19	Q What did you tell him?	
20	A I told him we are conducting an investigation and I	
21	needed him to come outside with us.	
22	Q Did you tell him you wanted to bring him back to	
23	the 72 precinct?	
24	A Yes. I told him he needed to come back to the 72	
25	precinct.	

1	Q	You have to wait for me to finish my question.
2	А	Sorry.
3	Q	Once he got outside did you handcuff him?
4	А	Yes, I did.
5	Q	And you then transport him to the precinct?
6	А	Yes, I did.
7	Q	Once you arrived at the precinct where did you put
8	him?	
9	А	72 Detective Squad interview room.
10	Q	Where is that located in the precinct?
11	А	Second floor in the Detective Squad.
12	Q	Was the Defendant handcuffed once you left him in
13	the room	or did you take the handcuffs off?
14	А	Handcuffs were off of him.
15	Q	About what time was it when you arrived back at the
16	precinct	?
17	А	Approximately 0500 hours.
18	Q	About five o'clock in the morning?
19	А	Yes.
20	Q	I want to direct your attention to about 5:15 in
21	the morn	ing. Did there come a time when you actually spoke
22	with the	Defendant?
23	А	Yes, I did.
24	Q	Did you speak with him in that interview room?
25	A	Yes, I did.
	I	

1	Q And was anybody else with you when you spoke with
2	him?
3	A Yes.
4	Q Who was with you?
5	A Detective Gaynor.
6	Q Before you speak to the Defendant did you read him
7	his Miranda rights?
8	A Yes, I did.
9	Q How is it you were able to read his Miranda rights
10	to him?
11	A I read it off a sheet of paper.
12	Q Is it a preprinted sheet of paper?
13	A Yes, it is.
14	Q Do you have that sheet of paper with you today?
15	A Yes, I do.
16	MS. CHU: If I could have that deemed marked 2
17	for identification.
18	THE COURT: Deemed marked.
19	Q Were any marks made on the Miranda sheet on
20	February 28th, 2005?
21	A Yes, there were.
22	Q Who made those marks?
23	A Myself, Enrique Rivera and Detective Gaynor.
24	Q They were made when you actually read him his
25	rights?

1	A That's correct.
2	Q That is the actual sheet you read to him?
3	A Correct.
4	MS. CHU: At this time I would offer that into
5	evidence as People's number 2.
6	MR. DRANOVE: May I see that please?
7	THE COURT: Certainly.
8	(Handing.)
9	MR. DRANOVE: Thank you.
10	THE COURT: Any objection counsel?
11	MR. DRANOVE: No.
12	THE COURT: So moved People's 2 in evidence
13	deemed marked.
14	Q Detective Darino, would you please demonstrate the
15	way you advised the Defendant of his rights and include
16	anything that he said to you back.
17	A Yes. You have the right to remain silent and
18	refuse to answer any questions; do you understand?
19	His reply was yes and he placed his initials
20	Enrique Rivera next to it.
21	Anything you say
22	THE COURT: I'm going to stop you.
23	There are yeses written on that sheet. Who
24	wrote those yeses?
25	THE WITNESS: Enrique Rivera.

THE COURT: After you asked the question he 1 2 would sign yes and then initial it? 3 THE WITNESS: Yes. 4 THE COURT: Continue with your answer. 5 0 Did he do that after each question or all together? 6 Α After each question. 7 Continue. 0 Anything you do say may be used against you in a 8 9 court of law; do you understand? 10 You have the right to consult an attorney before 11 speaking to the police and to have an attorney present 12 during any questioning now and in the future; do you 13 understand? 14 If you cannot afford an attorney one will be 15 provided to you without costs; do you understand? 16 If you do not have an attorney available you have 17 the right to remain silent until you have the opportunity to consult with one; do you understand? 18 19 Now that I have advised you of your rights are you 20 willing to answer any questions? 21 In Enrique's own handwriting he wrote I understand 22 my rights underneath all the questions. 23 On all of the questions did he answer yes to all 24 your questions? 25 Α Yes.

Did he write the word yes after each question? 1 2 Α Yes. And he wrote his initials after each yes? 3 0 4 Yes, he did. Α He also signed this piece of paper? 5 0 6 Α Yes, he did. Once he was read his Miranda rights did Enrique 7 Rivera agree to speak to you? 8 9 Yes. Yes, he did. 10 Could you tell us what sum and substance did he 11 tell you? 12 He stated he went to the bar on February 27th at night on 39th Street and Third Avenue and he was there 13 14 having a few drinks when he got into a small confrontation 15 with a guy from the bar. He said it was just -- he said he 16 was getting eye contact from a male and as he went to get a second round of drinks the guy was still looking at him and 17 he looked back at the guy and the guy said to him what's up? 18 And he asked the quy what seems to be the problem? And he 19 20 said the crowd rose and he felt punching and grabbing so he 21 took out a knife. He said he used it in self-defense, 22 swinging it at the crowd not knowing that he really hurt 23 anyone. He got in his car and went home. He didn't know anyone was hurt and it was self-defense. He didn't mean it. 24

He was just scared. He knew by saying sorry wasn't going to

1	bring the person back, but he didn't really mean things to
2	go down that way and he was very sorry.
3	Q After the Defendant made the statement was the
4	statement made in a narrative form just like how you read it
5	or was it more like a question and answer?
6	A It was a question and answer.
7	Q Did you tell him what the investigation was about?
8	A Yes, I did.
9	Q Before he actually spoke to you?
10	A Correct.
11	Q What did you tell him?
12	A I told him we are conducting an investigation of an
13	incident that occurred at El Borinquen Bar on 39th and Third
14	Avenue and then he told me he was in the bar and that is
15	how
16	Q How the story goes?
17	A Exactly.
18	THE COURT: We are going to stop you one
19	second.
20	What is the name of the bar again?
21	THE WITNESS: El Borinquen.
22	Q Once he gave you this oral statement did you ask
23	him to write it down for you?
24	A Yes, I did.
25	Q Did you provide him with paper and pen?

1	A Yes,	I did.
2	Q Did y	ou remain in the room when he actually wrote
3	it out for you	?
4	A Yes,	I did.
5	Q Do you	have the statement that the Defendant wrote
6	for you on Feb:	ruary 28th, 2005?
7	A Yes,	I do.
8	1	MS. CHU: At this time if I could have that
9	deemed mar	ked People's 3.
10		THE COURT: Deemed marked.
11	Q Detec	tive, was that written in the Defendant's own
12	hand?	
13	A Yes,	it is.
14	Q And d	id he sign it on the bottom?
15	A Yes,	ne did.
16	Q Did y	ou make any marks on it as well?
17	A Yes,	I did.
18	Q When	did you make those marks?
19	A Prior	to the statement on the top of the
20	statement and	after the Defendant signed his name.
21	Q You a	lso wrote something on the bottom?
22	A Corre	ct. My name.
23	Q You p	ut your name?
24	A And D	etective Gaynor signed his name.
25	Q That	was done at the time the statement was made?

1	A Correct.
2	Q That is the actual statement that he wrote out for
3	you?
4	A Yes, it is.
5	MS. CHU: At this time I would offer that into
6	evidence as People's 3.
7	MR. DRANOVE: May I see the original?
8	(Handing.)
9	
10	MR. DRANOVE: Thank you.
11	THE COURT: Any objection counsel?
12	MR. DRANOVE: No.
13	THE COURT: So moved People's 3 in evidence
14	deemed marked.
15	May I see that please?
16	(Handing.)
17	MS. CHU: May I continue?
18	THE COURT: Yes. You don't have to read the
19	statement; I just read it.
20	Q Detective, I want to direct your attention to about
21	ten o'clock in the morning on February 28th, 2005. Did
22	there come a time the Defendant spoke with an Assistant
23	District Attorney from the Kings County DA's office?
24	A Yes, he did.
25	Q Was the conversation recorded in any way?
	ii

1	A Yes, it was.
2	Q How was it recorded?
3	A On videotape.
4	Q Were you present when this conversation took place?
5	A Yes, I was.
6	Q Did the Assistant District Attorney have any
7	conversations with the Defendant that was not on videotape?
8	A No.
9	Q Do you recall what tape number was assigned to the
10	video?
11	A Yes, I do.
12	Q What was it?
13	A Robert R 05-0027.
14	MS. CHU: At this time, your Honor, I would
15	like this deemed marked People's 4 and open and play it.
16	THE COURT: Counsel.
17	MR. DRANOVE: I see an envelope. I've already
18	seen what was supposed to be a copy of the tape. I have
19	no objection so far.
20	THE COURT: We will deem it marked People's 4
21	and play it.
22	MS. CHU: Want me to do it here or there?
23	MR. DRANOVE: Judge, is there a way I could
24	seat myself and my client a little more reasonably so we
25	can see?

1	THE COURT OFFICER: Can you slide over?
2	THE COURT: It's up to the security of the
3	courtroom.
4	THE COURT OFFICER: Mr. Rivera, you could sit
5	over here please.
6	THE COURT: If you would like to sit in the
7	jury box you can, counsel.
8	MR. DRANOVE: I think it's appropriate for me
9	to sit here.
10	THE COURT: Whatever you want.
11	(Tape played.)
12	(Tape stopped.)
13	THE COURT: Let the record reflect we just
14	viewed the tape.
15	Q Was that a fair and accurate recording of the
16	entire conversation had between Assistant District
17	Attorney Sipress and the Defendant Enrique Rivera on
18	February 28th, 2005?
19	A Yes, there was.
20	Q Were there any additions or deletions from the
21	tape?
22	A No.
23	MS. CHU: At this time I would offer into
24	evidence as People's 4.
25	MR. DRANOVE: No objection.

THE COURT: So moved People's 4 in evidence 1 2 for purpose of the hearing deemed marked. 3 I direct your attention Detective to about four 4 p.m. on the same day, February 28th of 2005. Did there 5 come a time when you prepared to conduct lineups in this 6 case? 7 Yes, I did. Α And who was going to be the subject of the lineups? 8 9 Α Mr. Enrique Rivera. 10 Did you contact any witnesses to come to view the 11 lineup at the precinct? 12 Yes, I did. Α 13 Using the numbers that we were using before, can 14 you just tell me how many people did you try and contact to view the lineup? 15 16 Α Six. 17 Six people. What did you tell them when you 18 contacted them? I informed that I needed them to come to the 72 19 20 precinct to view a lineup. 21 How did they come to the precinct if you recall? 22 Number five and six was picked up and taken back to 23 the 72 precinct. One, two, three and four came on their 24 own. 25 Once they all were at the precinct where did you

1	put them?
2	A In separate rooms.
3	Q Where was the Defendant when these witnesses
4	arrived at the precinct?
5	A In the interview room.
6	Q The separate rooms you put the six witnesses in,
7	where is that in relation to where the Defendant was being
8	held?
9	A Feet wise?
10	Q I'm sorry, let me withdraw that. The room that the
11	Defendant was in is there a door to that room?
12	A Yes, there is.
13	Q Was the door opened or closed?
14	A Closed.
15	Q Is there a window on the door at all?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Is there a covering on the window or can you see
18	out?
19	A There is a covering on the window.
20	Q There is only one door to that room?
21	A Correct.
22	Q From the rooms that you put all the other six
23	witnesses in can you see into that interview room at all?
24	A No.
25	THE COURT: Is the interview room the same

room that the subject to the lineup was going to be viewed? 1 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 2 THE COURT: It's the viewing room and 3 4 interview room. 5 Once the witnesses were at the precinct did you give them any instructions regarding not wandering 6 around the precinct, etc.? 7 Yes. 8 Α What did you tell them? 9 10 I told them to stay in the room they were in until 11 we conducted the lineup. 12 Were each of the witnesses placed in different rooms or were any of them together? 13 14 Number five and six were together. Did there come a time when you actually went to go 15 16 get fillers for this? 17 Α Yes, there was. 18 Where did you get the fillers from? Two fillers were from the neighborhood. Three were 19 20 police officers. 21 Did you already prearrange for the officers to 22 participate in the lineup before the witnesses got to the 23 precinct? 24 Yes, I did. Α 25 0 And did you ask them to remain in an area where

1 they would not be seen in the precinct? 2 Yes, I did. 3 Q Where did you ask them in remain? 4 Α In the police locker room. 5 Where is that? 0 Basement of the precinct. 6 7 Once the fillers were brought back to the 8 precinct --9 You said there were two fillers that were brought 10 from the neighborhood 11 Α Yes. 12 Where were they placed? 13 In the interview room. Where the Defendant was? 14 Q 15 Α Correct. 16 What was done with the three officers that were Q 17 down in the basement? 18 Then they were brought up into the interview room. 19 When the fillers are brought into the interview 20 room and when the three officers were brought into the 21 interview room where the Defendant was did they have to pass 22 at all the areas where the witnesses were being held? 23 Α No. 24 Once they were all in the interview room did you 25 offer the Defendant the position that he wanted to sit in?

1	A	Yes, I did.
2	Q	What position did he select?
3	A	He selected position number 4.
4	Q	What did you do with the other numbers?
5	A	I handed out the numbers to other positions.
6	Q	Random
7	A	Randomly.
8	Q	Did you take any photographs of this lineup once
9	they were situated in their positions with their numbers?	
10	A	Yes, I did.
11	Q	Do you have those photographs with you today?
12	A	Yes, I do.
13		MS. CHU: At this time, your Honor, if I could
14	have	that deemed marked People's 5 collectively.
15		THE COURT: Counsel. I'm sorry. Deemed
16	mark	ed.
17	Q	Detective, who took those photographs?
18	A	One of the detectives that was assisting me.
19	Q	How were the photographs taken?
20	A	With a Polaroid camera.
21	Q	Were they taken of all six together or separate?
22	A	Three and three.
23	Q	To first three?
24	A	First three and last three.
25	Q	Do those photographs fairly and accurately depict

1	how the lineup appeared before they began?
2	A Yes, they do.
3	MS. CHU: At this time, your Honor, I would
4	offer them into evidence as People's 5.
5	MR. DRANOVE: May I examine them?
6	THE COURT: Certainly.
7	(Handing.)
8	
9	MR. DRANOVE: Thank you.
10	THE COURT: Counsel.
11	MR. DRANOVE: Are they being numbered as 5A and
12	5B? I have no objection.
13	THE COURT: We will deem them marked 5A and
14	5B.
15	1 through 3 would be A and 4 through 6 will be
16	B. Any objection counsel?
17	MR. DRANOVE: No.
18	THE COURT: So moved People's 5A and B in
19	evidence.
20	Q Once the lineup was set up which number witness did
21	you get first to view the lineup?
22	A Number one.
23	Q What did you tell number one before you brought
24	them in to look at the lineup?
25	A Explained that he was going to view a lineup, there

1	would be six individuals in the room and if he recognized	
2	anybody I wanted him to let me know.	
3	Q	What number?
4	А	What number did he choose?
5	Q	You asked him if they recognized anybody tell you
6	which number?	
7	А	Correct.
8	Q	Did you ask them to tell you anything else they
9	recognized?	
10	А	And where did they recognize that individual from.
11	Q	Number one went first?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	About what time did number one view the lineup?
14	А	Approximately 4:18 p.m.
15	Q	Did witness number one identify anybody in the
16	lineup?	
17	А	Yes, he did.
18	Q	Who did he identify?
19	А	Position number 4, Enrique Rivera.
20	Q	What did this witness tell you where he recognized
21	position	number 4 from?
22	А	He said he recognized him from the El Borinquen
23	Bar. He	said that is the guy who stabbed the victim.
24	Q	Where did witness number one go next?
25	A	He exited through the side door.

1	Q Who was gotten next, which number?
2	A Witness number two.
3	Q Witness number two, about what time did they view
4	the lineup?
5	A At 4:20 p.m.
6	Q Did you say the same thing to witness number two?
7	A Yes, I did.
8	Q Did witness number two identify anybody in the
9	lineup?
10	A Yes, he did.
11	Q Who did he identify?
12	A Position number 4.
13	Q Which was?
14	A Enrique Rivera.
15	Q Did they tell you where they recognized Enrique
16	Rivera from?
17	A Yes, he did.
18	Q From where?
19	A He said from the El Borinquen Bar. He said that is
20	the guy who punched the kid.
21	Q Where was witness number two placed?
22	A Witness number two exited through the side door.
23	Q Same place that witness number one just left from?
24	MR. DRANOVE: Your Honor, could I have read
25	back the question and answer preceding the current

question and answer?
(Whereupon, the Reporter read back as
requested.)
Q I believe we just completed witness number two?
A Correct.
Q Who was gotten next?
A Witness number three.
Q Did you say the same questions that you stated to
us earlier regarding if he recognized anybody?
A Yes, I did.
Q Did witness number three identify anybody in the
lineup?
A Yes, he did.
Q Who did they identify?
A Position number 4.
Q Who was in position number 4?
A Enrique Rivera.
Q Did they tell you where they recognized Enrique
Rivera from?
A Yes, he did.
Q From where?
A He said in the El Borinquen Bar. He stated that's
the stabber.
Q Where was witness number three placed?
A He exited through the side door.

1	Q	Where one and two also exited from?
2	А	That is correct.
3	Q	Was witness number four next?
4	А	Yes, he was.
5	Q	And can you tell me witness number four did they
6	recogniz	e anyone in the lineup?
7	А	No, he didn't. He did not.
8	Q	They did not?
9	А	No.
10	Q	Where was witness number four placed?
11	A	He exited through the side door.
12	Q	Was witness number five next?
13	А	Yes, she was yes, they were.
14	Q	And did witness number five identify anybody in the
15	lineup?	
16	А	Yes, they did.
17	Q	And what number did they recognize?
18	А	Position four.
19	Q	Did they tell you where they recognized the
20	Defendan	t from?
21	А	Yes, they did.
22	Q	I'm sorry, who was in position number 4?
23	А	Enrique Rivera.
24	Q	Where did they recognize Enrique Rivera?
25	А	From El Borinquen Bar. They stated that's Enrique.

1	Q	Where was witness number five taken?
2	А	To view the lineup.
3	Q	Where is number five who just viewed the lineup?
4	А	Exited through the side door.
5	Q	Six, were they next?
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	Did they get brought in to view the lineup?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	Did they recognize anyone in the lineup?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	Who?
12	А	Position number 4.
13	Q	Who was in position number 4?
14	А	Enrique Rivera.
15	Q	Did they tell you where they recognized Enrique
16	Rivera f	rom?
17	А	Yes, they did.
18	Q	From where?
19	А	Said that's the guy swinging his arm and punching
20	the vict	im.
21	Q	Where was witness number six taken after that?
22	А	He exited through the side door.
23	Q	Once each witness was done were they able to
24	converse	at all with any of the other witnesses who had not
25	viewed t	he lineup yet?
	1	

1	A No.
2	Q Was the Defendant given an opportunity to change
3	his position after each lineup was conducted?
4	A Yes, he was.
5	Q Did he opt to change his position?
6	A No, he did not.
7	Q He remained in position number 4 for all six
8	lineups?
9	A That's correct.
10	Q Did the Defendant have any opportunity to eat,
11	drink or use the facilities while he was in your custody?
12	A Yes, he did.
13	Q What?
14	A He ate egg and cheese on a roll and coffee. He had
15	three slices of pizza and a bottle of Sprite. He had water
16	and coffee throughout the course of the day and an
17	opportunity to use the restroom.
18	Q Once the lineups were completed did you place the
19	Defendant under arrest at this time?
20	A Yes, I did.
21	MS. CHU: Thank you very much. I have nothing
22	further.
23	THE COURT: Counsel.
24	MR. DRANOVE: May I have a brief recess, your
25	Honor? I'll be finished before the lunch hour for sure.

1	Five minutes.
2	THE COURT: Five minutes.
3	MR. DRANOVE: Thank you.
4	(Witness excused.)
5	(Short recess taken.)
6	(Witness resumes the witness stand.)
7	THE CLERK: Let the record reflect the
8	Defendant is present with counsel, Assistant District
9	Attorney present. You're reminded you're under oath.
10	THE COURT: Counsel.
11	
12	
13	CROSS-EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. DRANOVE:
15	Q Detective, did you make any notes with respect to
16	whether the individuals identified as numbers one
17	through six identified anybody in the photo array that
18	you showed them?
19	A Excuse me? Can you rephrase that? Can you
20	rephrase that question?
21	Q Did witness number one identify a photo?
22	A No.
23	THE COURT: Who did you show the photo array
24	to?
25	THE WITNESS: Number six.

1	THE COURT: Any of the other witnesses that
2	viewed the lineup?
3	THE WITNESS: No.
4	Q Why not?
5	A Because once I did it with number six I believed
6	that was appropriate.
7	THE COURT: Counsel please just pick a spot.
8	Either stand over there or there.
9	MR. DRANOVE: I've been sitting a long time.
10	THE COURT: Or you could use the podium here.
11	You could stand over by the edge of the jury box or
12	stand where you are.
13	Q Were you present throughout the interview that was
14	videotaped and shown to us?
15	A Yes, I was.
16	Q Did you at any time hear Mr. Enrique Rivera say yes
17	in response to the question now that I've advised you of
18	your rights are you willing to answer my questions?
19	A On the video?
20	Q When you were there did you hear him say yes to
21	that question?
22	A Well, on the video you're saying; correct?
23	Q All right. On the video did you hear him say it on
24	the video?
25	A I believe he said yeah.

THE COURT: Stop for the record. 1 I just saw the video. He nodded his head at first and someone, not the interviewer, said you have to 3 4 answer the question and that is when he said yes. MR. DRANOVE: Different question and answer. 5 I've seen the video several times. Unfortunately, it's 6 7 been removed from the room as if it's not relevant to the Court's examination. 8 9 May I show the video to the witness? THE COURT: Stop. Move on. 10 11 MR. DRANOVE: I have a clear recollection that the witness did not say yes to that question. 12 THE COURT: Please pick a spot. 13 14 MR. DRANOVE: I'll stand right here. 15 THE COURT: No. Back further. I gave you 16 three choices. Pick a spot. It's good we do this now 17 so when we are doing this during the trial we won't have 18 to do this. It's one of my pet peeves. I apologize 19 with that. I have real problems with attorneys 20 wandering around the courtroom when they are questioning 21 the witness. 22 MR. DRANOVE: Whatever your recollection or my 23 recollection, the tape speaks for itself. 24 THE COURT: Absolutely. 25 MR. DRANOVE: My recollection is "we here", not

1	yes. I ask your Honor to decide whether my client
2	answered in the affirmative the question, now I've
3	advised you of your rights are you willing to answer my
4	questions? If you listen again it's "we here".
5	THE COURT: We here?
6	MR. DRANOVE: Yes, we here.
7	THE COURT: Whether it was we here or yes it
8	was clearly an acknowledgment. There was an up and down
9	shaking of the head to the question. That is clearly my
10	recollection. In any event, you can move on.
11	MR. DRANOVE: I have no further questions.
12	THE COURT: Any redirect?
13	MS. CHU: No.
14	THE COURT: You're excused.
15	(Witness excused.)
16	THE COURT: Let's play the beginning of the
17	video one more time. Let the record reflect I'm
18	reviewing the beginning portion of the video again.
19	MR. DRANOVE: Can we all see it?
20	THE COURT: Yes. We are all going to view it
21	right now.
22	MR. DRANOVE: I thought you were going to look
23	at it on the computer.
24	THE COURT: I don't know if I could.
25	(Tape played.)

1	(Tape stopped.)
2	THE COURT: Let the record reflect that I did
3	view the first portion of the video again where the
4	Defendant was read his rights. The tape speaks for
5	itself. Record should reflect counsel was absolutely
6	correct that the Defendant indicated his acquiescence.
7	What the Court viewed his acquiescence to the proceeding
8	by saying "we here". In any event, we will proceed.
9	Counsel was correct.
10	Call your next witness Miss Chu.
11	MS. CHU: People call Detective James Gaynor.
12	DETECTIVE JAMES GAYNOR, having been first duly
13	sworn, testified as follows:
14	THE CLERK: In a loud clear voice give us your
15	name, shield and command.
16	THE WITNESS: Detective James Gaynor. Shield
17	1000. Brooklyn South Homicide Squad.
18	THE CLERK: Spell your name.
19	THE WITNESS: G-A-Y-N-O-R.
20	THE COURT: Counsel.
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION
22	BY MS. CHU:
23	Q Detective, how long have you been a member of the
24	New York City Police Department?
25	A Twenty years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I want to direct your attention to February 27th of 0 2005. Were you working on that day? Yes, I was. Α Q Did there come a time when you became involved in the investigation into the death of Edgar Ojeda? Α Yes, I did. During the course of your investigation did there come a time when you were looking to speak with someone in particular? Α Yes. Q Who was that? Α Enrique Rivera. Did you have any information on Enrique Rivera regarding his family members or where they lived? Α Yes. And I want to direct your attention now to February 28th of 2005 at about one o'clock in the morning. Did you find yourself at 30 Bush Street here in Brooklyn? Yes, I did. Α What location is 30 Bush Street? 0 Α That was the residence of Enrique Rivera's mother. Did you knock on the door? Q Yes, I did. Α And did anyone answer the door? Q Α Yes, she answered the door.

1	Q His mother?
2	A Yes.
3	Q What was her name?
4	A Anna Casallas.
5	Q Were you with anyone when you went to the location?
6	A I was with Detective Darino from the 72 Squad.
7	Q Once you were there did Miss Casallas, did she
8	speak English at all?
9	A Very little.
10	Q Did you tell her why you were there?
11	A I told her I was investigating a crime. I didn't
12	tell her exactly why I was there, no.
13	Q Did she seem to be able to understand what you were
14	telling her?
15	A Not all that.
16	MR. DRANOVE: Objection.
17	A Not all that well, no.
18	MR. DRANOVE: I withdraw.
19	Q Could you tell what language she spoke?
20	A Spanish.
21	Q What did you do?
22	A I went to the location in an attempt to locate
23	Enrique Rivera. I was unable to converse with her, speak
24	with her. I contacted Detective Rivera to translate for me.
25	Q While you were at the location did you actually go

inside the apartment? 1 2 Yes, I did. Α 3 Which apartment was that? 4 Α Can I look at my notes to refresh my memory? THE COURT: Go ahead. 5 Apartment 1D. 6 Α 7 1D? 0 Yes. 8 Α While you were inside apartment 1D did you observe 9 0 10 anything? 11 Α Yes, I did. 12 What did you observe? In the rear bedroom I observed a camouflage jacket, 13 14 green like army type hat and a brown sweatshirt on the 15 floor. Did you try and have any conversations with the 16 17 Defendant's mother with Enrique Rivera's mother regarding the clothing you saw on the floor? 18 19 Α Yes, I did. Were you able to communicate with her at all? 20 Q 21 Very little. Α 22 Pursuant to your investigation into the case did 23 you have any information regarding what the perpetrators were wearing who were involved in the crime regarding Edgar 24 25 Ojeda?

1 A Yes. 2 What information did you have? 3 It was similar clothing, camouflage jacket and A 4 green army hat. 5 You said you contacted Detective Rivera from the 72 6 precinct? 7 Α Yes. Why? 8 0 So he could translate and tell her mother what we 9 10 wanted to do with the clothing. 11 Did you use your cell phone? Q 12 No. I used my cell phone to his cell phone. Α 13 Did you get in touch with Detective Rivera? 14 Α Yes. 15 Once you spoke with him what did you tell him? 0 We had clothes here that fit the description of the 16 Α 17 clothing worn by the perpetrator in this case, that we wanted to take them, I wanted him to ask the mother if it 18 19 would be all right to take them. 20 Did you tell him any information about trying to 21 locate Enrique Rivera at that point? 22 Α Yes. We were also asking her if she knew where her 23 son was through Detective Rivera. 24 Did you then give the phone over to Miss Casallas? 25 Yes, I did. Α

1 Did she proceed to have a conversation on your 2 telephone? 3 Α Yes, she did. 4 Q What language was she speaking? 5 Spanish. Α After she had this conversation with Detective 6 7 Rivera on your telephone was the phone given back to you? Yes, it was. 8 Α 9 Did you speak to Detective Rivera? 10 Yes, I did. Α 11 What did he tell you? \circ 12 She said it would be all right if we took the Α 13 clothes. 14 Did she tell you whose clothing they were? She said it was her son Enrique's and he more than 15 Α 16 likely left them there at eight p.m. when he came because 17 when he was there earlier in the day she didn't see the 18 clothing on the floor. 19 At that point you then took the clothing? 20 Α Yes. 21 Did she give you any information about that she 22 will contact you if she saw Enrique? 23 Yes. She said she would contact us if she saw him Α 24 in the future. 25 Q What did you do with the clothing after you left

1	the apartment?
2	A It was taken back to the precinct and vouchered.
3	MS. CHU: Thank you very much. I have nothing
4	further.
5	THE COURT: Counsel.
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. DRANOVE:
8	Q Detective, what type of building is 30 Bush Street?
9	A It's a project, an apartment building.
10	Q How did you get from the street into the inside of
11	the building?
12	A There is a hallway door. I don't even know if it
13	was locked or not.
14	Q Do you recall if it was locked?
15	A I don't know if it was locked or if we were allowed
16	in, I'm not sure.
17	Q Did you have a search warrant with you?
18	A No, I didn't.
19	Q Arrest warrant?
20	A No.
21	Q At the time you went to the apartment had you
22	already called Officer Rivera?
23	A I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.
24	Q This police gentleman named Rivera, what is his
25	rank?

1	A Detective.
2	Q Was he a Detective then?
3	A Yes.
4	Q When did you call Detective Rivera?
5	A I called him while I was inside the apartment.
6	Q Is that the first time you called him on this run?
7	A I was in contact with him at different times
8	throughout the day regarding the whole case. He was working
9	the case with us.
10	Q You went to the apartment before you called
11	Detective Rivera?
12	A Correct.
13	MS. CHU: Objection.
14	THE COURT: Overruled. He just answered the
15	question yes.
16	Did you go to the apartment before you called
17	Officer Rivera?
18	THE WITNESS: Regarding the conversation I had
19	with the mother, but I had spoken with him a few times
20	during the course of the day.
21	Q What was your purpose in entering the apartment?
22	A In an attempt to locate Enrique Rivera.
23	Q Did you see him in the apartment?
24	A No.
25	Q You mentioned a brown sweatshirt?

1	A Yes.
2	Q Did you take that with you?
3	A Yes.
4	THE COURT: Who let you in the apartment?
5	THE WITNESS: The mother.
6	THE COURT: What did you say to her when you
7	got there?
8	THE WITNESS: I said we were looking to speak
9	to her son. She said he wasn't here.
10	THE COURT: Did she understand you?
11	THE WITNESS: She understands. Her husband
12	was also there. I think he speaks a little better
13	English than she did.
14	THE COURT: You asked if you could go in the
15	apartment?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes.
17	THE COURT: Did she understand?
18	THE WITNESS: I believe she did. She allowed
19	us.
20	THE COURT: She gave you permission to enter
21	the apartment?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	Q Did she say in English you have permission to enter
24	the apartment?
25	A No.

Q	Did she say in Spanish anything that you
understo	od?
A	Anything in Spanish that I understood? No.
Q	Did you talk to the husband?
А	I did, yes.
Q	Do you recall his name?
A	No, I don't.
Q	What does he look like?
A	He is five foot four, rather stocky.
Q	Did you speak to him?
A	Yes, I did.
Q	In English?
A	Yes.
Q	What did you tell him?
A	I told him that we were looking to speak to his
son.	
Q	Did he tell you his son wasn't there?
A	Yes.
	THE COURT: I'm going to stop you. You
indi	cated the mother gave you permission to enter the
apar	tment. How was that conveyed to you if not in
Engl	ish?
	THE WITNESS: I don't remember if it was
conv	eyed directly through her or the father, but they
allo	wed us to come in.
	understo A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A indi apar Engl

1	I said would it be all right for us to come
2	in? I believe the father said you could come in.
3	THE COURT: You were specifically invited in
4	by one of the parties or both?
5	THE WITNESS: One of the parties. I'm not
6	certain which one.
7	THE COURT: Did the other party indicate to
8	you you shouldn't come in?
9	THE WITNESS: No.
10	THE COURT: They didn't want you to come in?
11	THE WITNESS: No. She was extremely
12	cooperative.
13	Q Were you accompanied by anybody in addition to the
14	other Detective, Detective Darino?
15	A There was another Detective. I think it may be
16	Detective O'Brien, I'm not certain. There was another
17	Detective from homicide, maybe O'Brien.
18	Q Did you knock on the door or ring a bell to the
19	apartment?
20	A No. We went inside and knocked.
21	Q On the door to the apartment?
22	A Yes.
23	Q Were all three of the detectives arranged within
24	ten feet of the door when one of you knocked on the door?
25	A Yeah. We were right by the front door. We might

1	have had somebody in the back that also might have been
2	there.
3	Q There may have been more than three?
4	A May have been more than three.
5	Q Back of what?
6	A Back of the building where the exit would have
7	been, the rear windows may have been in case he was there
8	and somebody came out.
9	Q Was that done pursuant to an agreement as to how
10	you would look for Mr. Rivera at that location?
11	A I don't understand the question.
12	Q You said there may have been someone in the back?
13	A Yes.
14	THE COURT: Was that specific employment?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, we would do that on any
16	case.
17	Q There were at least four law enforcement officers
18	on this run?
19	A Yes.
20	Q Any more?
21	A I don't believe so. There were other locations we
22	were looking to find him at.
23	Q Do you recall who opened the door?
24	A I'm rather certain it was the mother.
25	Q Did you then walk in and start talking to her?

A We talked to her in the door for a moment. After	
we were invited in we went to there is a table, a kitch	ien
area when you first get in.	
Q Anybody you were with of the Detectives with you	
speak and understand Spanish as far as you know?	
A I don't believe Detective O'Brien or Darino, no.	
MR. DRANOVE: No further questions.	
THE COURT: Counsel.	
MS. CHU: No questions.	
THE COURT: You're excused. Thank you.	
(Witness excused.)	
THE COURT: Call your next witness.	
MS. CHU: We call Detective Hector Rivera.	
DETECTIVE HECTOR RIVERA, having been first	
duly sworn, testified as follows:	
THE COURT: State your name, spell it, give	
your shield number and command.	
THE WITNESS: Hector Rivera, R-I-V-E-R-A.	
Shield 4926, 72 squad.	
THE COURT: Continue counsel.	
MS. CHU: Thank you.	
DIRECT EXAMINATION	
BY MS. CHU:	
Q Good afternoon Detective.	
A Good afternoon.	

1	Q How long have you been employed by the New York
2	City Police Department?
3	A Nineteen years.
4	Q You're currently assigned to the 72 precinct?
5	A Excuse me.
6	Q The 72 precinct?
7	A Yes.
8	Q I want to direct your attention to February 27th of
9	2005. Did there come a time when you became involved in the
10	investigation into the death of Edgar Ojeda?
11	A Yes, I did.
12	Q Now I want to direct your attention to the
13	following day, February 28th of 2005 at about one o'clock in
14	the morning. Did there come a time when you were contacted
15	by Detective Gaynor from Brooklyn South Homicide?
16	A Yes.
17	Q And can you tell the Court where were you at that
18	time when you got contacted?
19	A I think I was in another apartment somewhere on
20	12th Street near the barber shop.
21	Q How did Detective Gaynor get in touch with you?
22	A By the cell phone.
	Q Did Detective Gaynor tell you what he wanted from
23	
23	you?

1	Q What did he tell you?
2	A He stated to me he needed me to translate because
3	he was speaking to Enrique Rivera's mother and she couldn't
4	understand too well.
5	Q Did he tell you what he wanted to inquire of her?
6	A Yes.
7	Q What did he tell you?
8	A He stated to me that he needed there was some
9	clothing in there and he needed me to explain to her that
10	the clothing that was in there he wanted permission to take
11	the clothing.
12	Q Did he also give you any indication to relay to her
13	information regarding Enrique Rivera's whereabouts?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Once he told you all this stuff you are fluent
16	in Spanish?
17	A Yes, I am.
18	Q Did you get on the phone with a woman after you
19	spoke with Detective Gaynor?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Did you identify yourself to this person?
22	A Yes.
23	Q What did you say?
24	A I stated to her my name is Detective Rivera and I
25	basically stated we are conducting an investigation in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

regards to her son and the Detective wanted to know that the clothing that was there that was left by him if she would give permission for him to take the clothing. Q What did the mother tell you? She stated that her son had came earlier and dropped off, I think she mentioned a baby, and he also might have left those clothes. Did she say about what time he had stopped by the apartment? I think she said about eight o'clock. Α Did she give any indication as to whether or not the Defendant lived with her? That he comes and goes, he doesn't live there. It was eight o'clock he went there, dropped off the child and left the clothing? Α Yes. Did she identify the clothing as being her son's? She stated those clothing weren't there before her Α son got there and when he left the clothing was there. Did she indicate to you anything regarding whether or not Detective Gaynor could take the clothing? Α Yes. What did she say? 0 Α Yes. Q That he could take the clothing?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	How did she sound to you; was she cooperative or
3	uncoopei	cative?
4		MR. DRANOVE: Objection.
5		THE COURT: Rephrase the question.
6	Q	Can you describe how she sounded on the phone?
7	A	Okay. She was a little concerned about her son,
8	want	ted to know what was going on, but she was very
9	coop	perative.
10	Q	Did you ask her any information regarding her son's
11	whereabo	outs?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	Did she have any information?
14	А	She said no. She said she didn't know where he was
15	at, but	if she had contact with him she would call.
16	Q	Once you got off the phone with her did you speak
17	with Det	tective Gaynor again?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Did you inform him what she had told you?
20	А	Yes.
21	Q	Other than what you just described did you have any
22	further	involvement?
23	А	No.
24		MS. CHU: Thank you very much. I have nothing
25	furt	cher.
	l	

1	THE COURT: Counsel.
2	CROSS-EXAMINATION
3	BY MR. DRANOVE:
4	Q Detective, did you speak to anyone else who was, as
5	you understood it, inside the apartment and related to
6	the lady you spoke to?
7	A I don't understand the question.
8	THE COURT: Did you speak to anybody else in
9	the apartment except for the lady that you spoke to?
10	THE WITNESS: No.
11	MR. DRANOVE: No further questions.
12	THE COURT: Any redirect?
13	MS. CHU: No.
14	THE COURT: You're excused. Thank you
15	Detective.
16	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
17	(Witness excused.)
18	THE COURT: Miss Chu, call your next witness.
19	MS. CHU: People have no further witnesses.
20	People rest.
21	MR. DRANOVE: I need an interpreter for my
22	witness.
23	THE COURT: What language?
24	MR. DRANOVE: Spanish. May I step outside?
25	THE COURT: Sure. We will get the interpreter

1	right now.
2	(A recess is taken.)
3	THE CLERK: Mr. Rivera is present with
4	counsel. Assistant District Attorney present.
5	THE COURT: Call your witness please.
6	MR. DRANOVE: I call Anna Casallas.
7	(Whereupon, the Official Spanish Interpreter
8	interpreted from English to Spanish and Spanish to
9	English.)
10	MR. DRANOVE: Can you tell Anna when she walks
11	up there to sit in the chair up there.
12	ANNA CASALLAS, having been first duly sworn,
13	testified as follows:
14	THE CLERK: If you'll give us your name and
15	county of residence please.
16	THE WITNESS: Anna Casallas, Brooklyn.
17	THE CLERK: Spell your last name.
18	THE WITNESS: C-A-S-A-L-L-A-S.
19	THE COURT: Counsel.
20	DIRECT EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. DRANOVE:
22	Q Good afternoon Mrs. Casallas.
23	A Good afternoon.
24	Q I'm going to ask you some questions and request you
25	answer them. If you don't understand the question

1	THE COURT: She has to speak. She can't just
2	nod her head.
3	THE WITNESS: Okay.
4	Q Can you hear me clearly?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Is Enrique Rivera who is sitting in the courtroom
7	over there one of your children?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Do you remember an unusual event at your apartment
10	in late February of 2005?
11	A Yes.
12	Q Did there come a time when you heard knocking on
13	the door?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Where were you when you heard that?
16	A In the living room.
17	Q What did you do when you heard that knocking?
18	A I went to the door and I saw some tall man standing
19	there and I was kind of afraid. I went back and told my
20	husband.
21	Q What language did you speak to your husband?
22	A Spanish.
23	Q What happened next?
24	A I opened the door.
25	Q What happened when you opened the door?

1	A They came in.
2	Q Did they speak to you before they came in?
3	A No.
4	Q Please describe their actions as they came in.
5	A When I opened the door they came in. One stayed in
6	the kitchen, one in the living room and the other went to
7	look around the house.
8	Q When they came in did they speak to your husband?
9	A Yes, they spoke to him, but in English and my
10	husband did not understand. He speak a little English.
11	MR. DRANOVE: No further questions.
12	THE COURT: Did the People who came into the
13	house identify themselves as police officers?
14	THE WITNESS: No.
15	THE COURT: How long have you been in America?
16	THE WITNESS: About twenty years.
17	THE COURT: Counsel.
18	
19	CROSS-EXAMINATION
20	BY MS. CHU:
21	Q Good afternoon Miss Casallas.
22	A Good afternoon.
23	Q We have never spoken; right?
24	A No.
25	Q What do you do for a living?

Q You baby-sit children? A Yes.	
3 A Yes.	
11	
4 Q Can you speak any English?	
5 A A little bit.	
6 Q Now you're saying when these large men came	e to the
7 door you said that they did not identify themselves	as
8 police officers to you?	
9 A No.	
10 Q Do you remember being on the telephone with	h
anybody?	
12 A No.	
Q Nobody gave you a cell phone to talk to an	ybody in
14 Spanish with?	
A One of them, but that was after they look	through
the house.	
Q So you did speak to someone on the telepho	ne?
THE COURT: Did you speak to someone	on the
19 telephone or not?	
THE WITNESS: They	
	peak to
THE COURT: The question is did you s	
21 THE COURT: The question is did you s 22 someone on the telephone or not?	
someone on the telephone or not?	

1	Q You spoke to this person in Spanish; correct?
2	A Yes because he was Hispanic.
3	Q Isn't it a fact that that person identified
4	themselves to you as being a police officer; isn't that
5	correct?
6	A No.
7	Q Well, didn't I hear you say policia when you were
8	speaking to the interpreter when you were on the phone?
9	MR. DRANOVE: I object to the prosecutor making
10	herself as a witness or that she be called as a witness.
11	THE COURT: I heard her say policia too.
12	In any event, ask the question again.
13	Q Miss Casallas, when you were just speaking with the
14	interpreter did you use the word policia?
15	MR. DRANOVE: Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Counsel, is that an objection?
17	MR. DRANOVE: It's an objection.
18	THE COURT: Overruled. Did you use that word?
19	THE WITNESS: They told me they was going to
20	put someone in Spanish, but didn't say it was a police
21	officer.
22	THE COURT: Stop. Who did you say came into
23	the apartment?
24	THE WITNESS: Detectives.
25	THE COURT: Don't you think Detectives work for

1	the police?
2	THE WITNESS: Yes.
3	THE COURT: So you knew they were police
4	officers when they came into your apartment?
5	MR. DRANOVE: Objection. There is no
6	testimony.
7	THE COURT: Counsel, I'm asking the question.
8	Stop.
9	MR. DRANOVE: I object.
10	THE COURT: Your objection is noted.
11	Did you think they were police officers when
12	they came into your apartment?
13	THE WITNESS: I thought something happened to
14	my son, that is why I opened the door.
15	THE COURT: When the people came into the
16	apartment did you know they were police officers?
17	THE WITNESS: The one that came in and looked
18	through the apartment, yes.
19	THE COURT: So you knew they were police
20	officers?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes.
22	MR. DRANOVE: Let her finish her answer please.
23	THE COURT: She said yes.
24	MR. DRANOVE: You interrupted her answer. She
25	already said when she was searching the apartment I knew

they were police.

THE COURT: I'm the trier of facts in this area. I want to get to the bottom of it.

If you have an objection note your objection. You'll have an opportunity to give me an oral argument at the end. You'll have an opportunity to redirect this witness. At this moment I ask you please be seated and allow the Court to inquire with respect to the facts.

MR. DRANOVE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So, these officers you knew they were Detectives when they were in the apartment. Was that before or after they gave you the telephone?

THE WITNESS: They went to look around and they talked between each other and they told me they were going to get an interpreter.

THE COURT: Did you know they were police officers before or after you had the telephone conversation?

THE WITNESS: When they came in I knew they were detectives because my husband was telling me they were detectives.

THE COURT: So when they made a phone call and gave the phone to you to speak to somebody did you know that the person was a detective on the other end of the phone?

THE WITNESS: No. 1 2 THE COURT: Counsel continue. Miss Casallas, isn't it a fact that the person that 3 spoke to you on the other side of the phone identified 4 5 themselves as being Detective Rivera? 6 Α No. 7 What did you speak to this person about? He asked if Mr. Enrique Rivera was living there and 8 9 if he was there and I told him no. And he said okay. 10 So, isn't it a fact that the Detective or the other 11 person on the phone asked you about the camouflage jacket 12 that was on the floor in your apartment? 13 Α No. 14 Isn't it a fact that you told Detective Rivera that 15 that camouflage jacket and clothing belonged to your son? 16 When he picked it up in the room he told me in 17 English and I could understand a little bit and he asked me 18 who do they belong to? And I told him they belong to my 19 son. 20 So you did tell the Detectives that that clothing 21 belonged to your son Enrique Rivera? 22 Α Yes. 23 Isn't it a fact that you told the Detectives that your son was there at about eight p.m. the night before; 24 25 isn't that correct?

1	A Yes, that he had been there, but he left. They
2	didn't believe me and they continued to look around the
3	house.
4	THE COURT: I'm going to stop you.
5	When you said that to the Detectives did you
6	say that on the phone to Detective Rivera or did you
7	tell the police officers who were in the apartment?
8	THE WITNESS: The ones that were in the house.
9	THE COURT: Did you say it in English or in
10	Spanish?
11	THE WITNESS: Spanish. Some things I tried to
12	say in English and I just try
13	Q How do you say your son's name?
14	A Kekay.
15	Q Kekay. That is his nickname; right?
16	A Uh huh.
17	Q That is short for Enrique?
18	A That is his name. I call him Kekay.
19	Q You call him Kekay.
20	MS. CHU: If I could have one moment, your
21	Honor.
22	Q Isn't it true, Miss Casallas, that once the
23	Detectives are inside your apartment and you identified
24	the clothing as being your son's that you allowed them
25	to take it?
	А

1	A No, they just took it without my permission.
2	Q You tried to stop them?
3	A No.
4	MS. CHU: I have nothing further, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Counsel.
6	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. DRANOVE:
8	Q Miss Casallas, did you give the police permission
9	to enter your apartment?
10	A No.
11	Q Did you hear your husband in English or Spanish
12	speak to the police as they were entering the apartment?
13	A In Spanish cause my husband don't speak English,
14	just a little bit.
15	MR. DRANOVE: No further questions.
16	THE COURT: Counsel.
17	RECROSS EXAMINATION
18	BY MS. CHU:
19	Q Miss Casallas, but you opened the door for them;
20	correct?
21	A Yes.
22	Q When they walked in you didn't try and push them
23	out; did you?
24	A No.
25	MS. CHU: Nothing further.

1	A I was afraid.
2	THE COURT: Any redirect counsel?
3	MR. DRANOVE: No. Miss Casallas, I think the
4	lawyers have no more questions for you. I don't know if
5	the Judge does, but thank you for coming here.
6	THE COURT: You're excused.
7	MR. DRANOVE: No further questions.
8	(Witness excused.)
9	THE COURT: Call your next witness counsel.
10	MR. DRANOVE: Judge, I'm not prepared to call
11	another witness now.
12	THE COURT: Does that mean the defense rests?
13	MR. DRANOVE: I would like to see if I could
14	get the stepfather in maybe this afternoon.
15	THE COURT: We will be back at 2:30. If you
16	want to have him have him here by 2:30.
17	MR. DRANOVE: I will do everything I can.
18	THE COURT: If there is any rebuttal witnesses
19	for purpose of the hearing you'll have your witnesses
20	ready at 2:30 also.
21	
22	AFTERNOON SESSION
23	
24	THE CLERK: This is a continuation of the
25	hearing from this morning, People versus Enrique Rivera

1	THE COURT: Call your next witness.
2	MR. DRANOVE: Mr. Carlos Casallas.
3	(Whereupon, an Official Spanish Interpreter
4	was present to interpreter English to Spanish and
5	Spanish to English.)
6	CARLOS CASALLAS, having been first duly sworn,
7	testified as follows:
8	THE CLERK: If you'll give us your name and
9	county of residence.
10	THE WITNESS: Carlos Casallas.
11	THE COURT: Spell it.
12	THE WITNESS: C-A-S-A-L-L-A-S.
13	THE CLERK: Do you live here in Kings County,
14	Brooklyn?
15	THE WITNESS: Red Hook, Brooklyn.
16	THE CLERK: Thank you.
17	THE COURT: Counsel.
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION
19	BY MR. DRANOVE:
20	Q Good afternoon Mr. Casallas. I'm going to ask you
21	questions and your answers have to be spoken. For
22	example, if the answer is yes you can't shake your head.
23	A Okay.
24	Q Thanks. Are you married?
25	A Yes.

1	Q Who is your wife?
2	A Anna, Anna Casallas.
3	Q She is sitting in the back of the courtroom?
4	A Yes, she is sitting in the back.
5	MR. DRANOVE: Because they are both witnesses I
6	would just like to now ask Miss Casallas to step out
7	because they may both end of testifying at trial.
8	THE COURT: Was she sitting here for the first
9	portion, the People's direct examination of the
10	witnesses this morning?
11	MR. DRANOVE: No.
12	THE COURT: You're sure she wasn't in the
13	courtroom this morning for those witnesses? I do
14	believe I saw her sitting there.
15	MR. DRANOVE: I asked her to step out early on.
16	She went into the witness room.
17	THE COURT: Have her step out. Just proceed.
18	Q Mr. Casallas, in late February of 2005 were you
19	home one evening when something unusual happened? Were
20	you at home when something unusual happened?
21	A Yes.
22	Q Please tell the Judge and everyone else in the
23	courtroom what happened.
24	A They knocked on the door and they knocked very
25	hard. And then my wife went to open the door. When my wife

opened the door there was a big group of men. They were
well dressed and they looked very strong. Then my wife got
scared. Then she turned around to let me know, but then at
that time they started to come into the apartment. And in
that group there was a woman.
Q When they started to enter the apartment did any of
them speak to you?
A No.
Q Did any of them speak to you in Spanish?
A No.
Q Did any of them speak to you in English?
A Not neither, no.
Q Did anyone of the people who entered the apartment
ask you for permission to enter the apartment?
A No, at no time at all.
MR. DRANOVE: Thank you. I have no further
questions. The prosecutor has the right to ask you
questions.
THE COURT: Thank you counsel. Miss Chu.
MS. CHU: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. CHU:
Q You said that there was a number of people that
were standing outside the door.
A When they opened the door I saw the group. When my

Q But she did open the door; correct? A Yes. Sure. Q Then she stepped away from the door; correct? THE INTERPRETER: And she stepped away from door? Q Then she stepped away from the door? A Yes, she stepped away to let me know. Q Well, that's when they walked in; right? A Yes. When she stepped away about one or two me they started to come in. Q Did you ever try and stop them or tell them to leave the apartment? A No, no, no.	
THE INTERPRETER: And she stepped away from door? The interpreter away from the door? Then she stepped away from the door? A Yes, she stepped away to let me know. Well, that's when they walked in; right? A Yes. When she stepped away about one or two me they started to come in. Did you ever try and stop them or tell them to leave the apartment?	
THE INTERPRETER: And she stepped away from door? Then she stepped away from the door? A Yes, she stepped away to let me know. Well, that's when they walked in; right? A Yes. When she stepped away about one or two me they started to come in. Did you ever try and stop them or tell them to leave the apartment?	
door? 7	
7 Q Then she stepped away from the door? 8 A Yes, she stepped away to let me know. 9 Q Well, that's when they walked in; right? 10 A Yes. When she stepped away about one or two me they started to come in. 11 Q Did you ever try and stop them or tell them to leave the apartment?	ers
A Yes, she stepped away to let me know. Q Well, that's when they walked in; right? A Yes. When she stepped away about one or two me they started to come in. Q Did you ever try and stop them or tell them to leave the apartment?	cers
Q Well, that's when they walked in; right? A Yes. When she stepped away about one or two ments they started to come in. Q Did you ever try and stop them or tell them to leave the apartment?	ters
10 A Yes. When she stepped away about one or two med they started to come in. 12 Q Did you ever try and stop them or tell them to leave the apartment?	ters
they started to come in. Q Did you ever try and stop them or tell them to leave the apartment?	ters
12 Q Did you ever try and stop them or tell them to 13 leave the apartment?	
leave the apartment?	
14 A No, no, no.	
15 Q Isn't it correct that you knew that they were	
police though; right?	
A I didn't know they were I didn't know that t	ney
were police officers or police. With so many people com	ing
in we were very nervous. They didn't show any document.	
THE COURT: What did you think was happeni	ng
when these men in suits came into your apartment?	
THE WITNESS: I didn't know what was happen	ing.
I asked them and they didn't answer me.	
THE COURT: So a bunch of men in suits jus	
25 walked into your apartment. Did you ask them why th	t

1	are coming in and who they were?
2	THE WITNESS: With a woman. Nobody answered.
3	Q Were you speaking in English or were you speaking in
4	Spanish?
5	A I was speaking in Spanish because I don't speak
6	English.
7	Q You don't speak any English?
8	A Very little.
9	Q What do you do for a living?
10	A I work for a company that makes books.
11	Q That makes books?
12	THE COURT: Spanish books?
13	THE WITNESS: No.
14	THE COURT: English books?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, in English.
16	Q How long have you worked for this company?
17	A Almost ten years.
18	THE COURT: Ten years you've been working for
19	a company that makes English books?
20	THE WITNESS: They distribute the books.
21	THE COURT: All right, Miss Chu, ask some
22	questions. Just answer the question.
23	MR. DRANOVE: Your Honor, let the witness
24	THE COURT: Counsel, I'm the one determining
25	the facts, please.

1 Mr. Casallas, how long have you been in this 2 country? 3 Α Twenty years. 4 Twenty years. In fact, your wife works too; right? Q 5 My wife is not working. I work for her. Α She doesn't work as a baby-sitter? 6 7 Well, she takes care of a child, you know, she 8 takes him to school. 9 How old is this child? 10 The child is about three years old. 11 Now, you said that no one asked you for permission Q 12 to enter into your apartment; is that what you're saying? 13 Nobody asked permission to come into my apartment. 14 Do you remember one of the men had white hair that Q 15 came into your apartment; do you remember that? 16 Α It was a group of men moving inside the apartment. 17 Were they jogging around your apartment? 18 MR. DRANOVE: Objection. No need to belittle 19 the witness. 20 THE COURT: Sustained. 21 Were any of the men or did any of the men have white 22 hair? I don't remember. 23 24 Did you stay inside that first area where you walk 25 into your apartment the entire time these men were inside

1 your apartment? 2 I stayed near the kitchen near the door. 3 Were you by your wife during the entire time these 4 people were in your house? 5 My wife went to one of the bedrooms. Do you recall that your wife actually got on one of 6 7 the Detective's cell phones while they were in your 8 apartment? 9 They allowed her to talk to somebody. 10 And she was speaking in Spanish; isn't that 11 correct? 12 Yes, that is correct. Α 13 Isn't it a fact that she told the person on the telephone that the clothing that was on the floor in your 14 15 apartment belonged to your son? 16 I didn't hear at that moment. 17 Do you recall that there was some clothing on the 18 floor inside your apartment? 19 They were my clothes. I have changed my clothing Α 20 and they wanted to take my clothing. 21 Did they take your clothing? 22 No because I told them not to take it, that it was 23 my clothes. 24 So they didn't take your clothes? Q 25 Α They put it back where it was.

1	Q Th	ney didn't want your clothes; right?
2		MR. DRANOVE: Objection.
3	A I	don't know.
4		MR. DRANOVE: Goes to state of mind.
5		THE COURT: Sustained.
6	Q Tł	nere were other clothes on the floor; isn't that
7	correct	? There was a camouflage jacket on the floor?
8	A Ir	n one of the bedrooms.
9	Q Tł	nat, in fact, was your son's jacket; is that
10	correct?	
11	A Ye	es.
12	Q Yo	our son, Enrique Rivera, who is sitting right over
13	there?	
14	A Y∈	es.
15	Q Ar	nd it had a matching hat to it too; right?
16	A I	don't remember the color. But I remember they
17	took the ja	acket, they took the hat and I think they took
18	some sneake	ers and they also took a sweater.
19	Q A	sweatshirt?
20	A Of	n, one that has like a hood.
21	Q Li	ike a hooded sweatshirt?
22	A I	don't know how they call it.
23	Q Ar	nd all those things or all those items of clothing
24	were, in fa	act, your son's, Enrique Rivera; correct?
25	A Th	ne ones that they took, yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Isn't it also true that Enrique Rivera had come by your house about eight p.m. the night before? Yes. Yes, he was in the house the day before, yes. In fact, that is when he left that clothing there on the floor? Yeah, he did change clothes, yes. You said that while your wife was on the telephone, one of the men's cell phone, that you didn't hear the entire conversation she had about the other person on the phone? I didn't hear her. Is it fair to say you don't know what she said on that telephone? No, I didn't hear. Yes. You never tried to tell the police that they needed to leave your apartment; did you? I was very nervous. There were many men in there and they were coming in and out, they were coming in and they were leaving. It was in and out, in and out. THE COURT: You testified earlier you didn't know who the men were. At any time did you find out who they were? THE WITNESS: No. They didn't present any credentials for me to find out who they were. THE COURT: At no time while they were in the house did you know they were police officers?

	THE WITNESS: They didn't present any
2	credentials.
3	THE COURT: Did you think these people came to
4	your apartment to rob your son's clothes?
5	THE WITNESS: No. They were very well dressed
6	to be thieves.
7	THE COURT: Continue counsel.
8	Q Isn't it a fact, sir, that you told your wife these
9	were police officers?
10	A No, I didn't know.
11	Q Well, if your wife said that you told her they were
12	police then she would be incorrect?
13	MR. DRANOVE: Objection.
14	THE COURT: Sustained.
15	MS. CHU: I have nothing further.
16	THE COURT: Counsel.
17	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
18	BY MR. DRANOVE:
18 19	BY MR. DRANOVE: Q Mr. Casallas, did you and I first meet this
19	Q Mr. Casallas, did you and I first meet this
19	Q Mr. Casallas, did you and I first meet this afternoon in this building?
19 20 21	Q Mr. Casallas, did you and I first meet this afternoon in this building? A Yes.
19 20 21 22	Q Mr. Casallas, did you and I first meet this afternoon in this building? A Yes. Q Were you at work this morning?

1	A Yes.
2	Q What do you do at the company?
3	A I gather orders to be sent to the doctors.
4	THE COURT: Are these orders written in
5	Spanish?
6	THE WITNESS: We go by numbers, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Are there only numbered orders?
8	THE WITNESS: Yes.
9	THE COURT: There is no English words on
10	there?
11	THE WITNESS: The titles of the books, though
12	the numbers are the important ones.
13	THE COURT: So you never read the titles on
14	the books?
15	THE WITNESS: I read the titles. I could try
16	to learn a little bit of English.
17	THE COURT: When you deliver a book and it
18	goes to the doctor and it's the wrong book and they tell
19	you it was the wrong book how do you know if it was or
20	wasn't the wrong book?
21	MR. DRANOVE: I object.
22	THE COURT: You brought it up, counsel. I'm
23	curious as to what the extent of his language skills
24	are. I think that is relevant to this hearing. I'm
25	also concerned about the credibility of this witness.

1	MR. DRANOVE: What about the Detectives?
2	THE COURT: I'm concerned about the credibility
3	of this witness.
4	MR. DRANOVE: What about the Detectives?
5	THE COURT: I'll hear your argument.
6	MR. DRANOVE: I'm not going to make an argument,
7	Judge, I think I understand.
8	THE INTERPRETER: Can you repeat the question?
9	THE COURT: I don't need to know the answer.
10	You're excused.
11	(Witness excused.)
12	THE COURT: Call your next witness.
13	MR. DRANOVE: I have no further witnesses,
14	Judge.
15	THE COURT: Any rebuttal requests?
16	MS. CHU: No.
17	THE COURT: Ready to proceed to argument
18	counsel?
19	MR. DRANOVE: I'll stand here.
20	THE COURT: Wherever you want.
21	MR. DRANOVE: Thank you. With respect to the
22	recorded statement I believe it's clear my client did
23	not affirmatively waive his rights and that the
24	prosecution has the burden of proof that he did and they
25	cannot prove it.

With respect to the other two statements the testimony stands.

With respect to the lineup the Judge has seen the pictures. Judge, you've seen the pictures and you'll make up your own mind.

With respect to entry into the apartment, what are two humble, simple people supposed to do when a bunch of large white guys start walking in?

THE COURT: We don't know if they were all white people.

MR. DRANOVE: We saw two of them. They come in, we know they are hot on a trail of someone who is an alleged perpetrator. These are simple people, Judge, they are not going to call a lawyer. When the lady turned around to tell her husband these people are here they just came in and they are waiting for you to sort it out in a way that favors them. I think they are salt of the earth people who told the truth.

If a man picks a book by number that doesn't make him fluent in English. That is all he does, he picks it by number and it goes somewhere else. He is not in the department of speaking to doctors who orders books.

A woman who is taking care of a baby is another humble person. I think the testimony speaks for

1 itself.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The Detectives, didn't have any warrants, who think they are going to find a man there, don't. They kept looking. They had no right to take any property. My client didn't give them permission to take the property. They had no right to be in the apartment in the first place.

Some of these questions, such as did you try to push the detectives out -- I mean, could you imagine if she tried to push the Detectives out?

THE COURT: Let's not point fingers or address anybody in an unprofessional manner.

MR. DRANOVE: If anybody tried to push

Detectives out of an apartment they would be arrested

for obstruction of justice, assault and after they got

out of the hospital for the beating for being put in

their place. To ask that of these people I think is

insulting to all of us.

The entry was illegal. Everything that flows from it should be suppressed.

THE COURT: Meaning the property recovered?

MR. DRANOVE: The property.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, counsel.

MR. DRANOVE: You're welcome, sir.

THE COURT: Miss Chu.

22232425

MS. CHU: Yes, your Honor.

Going to the Huntley portion of the hearing first, I believe the evidence given at the time of this hearing indicated that each and every statement the Defendant gave to both the police as well as the Assistant District Attorney were a voluntarily, knowing and intelligent waiver of his Miranda rights.

The defense counsel made issue with regard to the fact that the Defendant during the videotaped statement said "we here". I think it's quite clear from his actions he was acquiescing in speaking to the Assistant District Attorney after being advised of all of his rights.

THE COURT: He had been advised earlier when he was first arrested.

MS. CHU: True.

THE COURT: I believe that was exhibit --

MS. CHU: Exhibit 2.

THE COURT: 2 in evidence.

MS. CHU: Moving on to the Wade portion of the hearing. Obviously, your Honor, you have the photographic array in evidence as well as the lineup photos.

THE COURT: Why don't we address the last issue.

MS. CHU: Okay, I'll move on to that.

I think Detective Gaynor and Detective
Rivera's testimony has not been controverted despite the
fact that both Mr. and Mrs. Casallas has testified at
this hearing regarding what transpired as being
something different than from Detective Gaynor and
Detective Rivera testified to.

Detective Gaynor and Detective Rivera, I thought, were credible witnesses setting forth exactly how they proceeded. I think it's clear once Detective Gaynor was speaking with both of them he indicated that he knew that they were having difficulty understanding what they were saying and that is why they reached out to Detective Rivera, which was corroborated by both Mr. and Mrs. Casallas, that she was on the telephone, on one of their cell phones.

I think Mr. and Mrs. Casallas actually didn't jive with each other because she said the reason why --

THE COURT: Miss Chu, that aside, what about the fact that they didn't make a phone call until they were already in the apartment?

MS. CHU: That is because they didn't know what the language abilities would be.

THE COURT: If they didn't know if he could speak English or not what were they doing in the

1	apartment?
2	MS. CHU: He said they were let in. They had
3	limited amounts of English. Each witness says they
4	speak a little English.
5	In her testimony she says she looked through
6	the peephole, sees the people outside, goes to see her
7	husband and then goes outside.
8	He testified she already opened the door and
9	then goes to get him.
10	There they are not even consistent with what
11	it is they are trying to set forth to this Court as who
12	how the door got opened.
13	THE COURT: I think they were consistent and
14	suggest to the Court they never gave permission of these
15	people to go into the apartment. I think they were
16	called for that purpose and said the same thing.
17	MS. CHU: I thought it was inconsistent in
18	their recollection of how the door opened, why she
19	turned around.
20	THE COURT: That goes to their credibility as
21	to their consistency or purpose for why they testified.
22	Is there anything else?
23	MS. CHU: Yes, your Honor.
24	I believe whatever transpired during her

either walking away or letting Detective Gaynor and

25

whoever he was with and Detective Darino come to the apartment it was clear that action alone can give consent for someone coming in.

In fact, there is a case People versus Davis
120 AD2d at page 604 where it says that stepping aside
to allow the police to enter the premises can be
considered consent. You don't actually need words to
say yes, you may come into my home.

THE COURT: When was that decided and where? What was the site?

MS. CHU: People versus Davis.

THE COURT: It's all right. Proceed. It's okay. Just proceed.

MS. CHU: There is also case law in People's versus Schoff 136 AD2d 578 Second Department 1988 case. It says once the police have entered the home, not directing them to leave or in any way indicating that they don't have permission to remain is also considered to be consent.

I believe that once the Detectives were inside the apartment, not being asked to leave, I believe that they believed by Miss Casallas opening the door and moving away from the door that she was letting them in.

Once they are inside the apartment the clothing on the floor was in plain view. Knowing that the perpetrators

that were involved in this case were wearing very specific clothing; camouflage coat, camouflage hats, etc., and seeing that type of clothing there, once they spoke to Detective Rivera who translated what Miss Casallas said, she corroborated as well, she indicated that clothing was her son's and that it had been left there when he was there at eight o'clock. It corroborates the testimony by Detective Rivera and Detective Gaynor about the conversations that they had with her via Detective Rivera translating.

I believe once they were in there the plain view doctrine supersedes that they could have taken those items of clothing, in addition to the fact that Detective Rivera indicated she said it was okay for them to take it. In fact, she was very cooperative with them. She said she would let them know if she got in touch with her son, she would contact them.

I believe the evidence before this Court is clear they had consent not only to enter the apartment, but they had consent to take the clothing they saw in plain view in the apartment.

These witnesses say he doesn't even live

there. I don't know whether or not right to privacy

issues come into effect. I think consent and plain view

doctrine should come into effect when seizing the

Defendant's property from the apartment.

MR. DRANOVE: May I?

THE COURT: Briefly.

MR. DRANOVE: Interesting the prosecutor asked you to accept the testimony of defense witnesses as a hundred percent true in each and every regard except saying they didn't give permission to enter.

The fact she cites a case where perhaps we find someone who says you want to come in, step aside, that is not what happened here.

I recall arguing a case in the Appellate

Division First Department People versus Glasstone Graham in the Bronx. They got into the building, they went to an apartment, knocked on the door to the apartment he was in. Someone opened the door and they went in. In that apartment they found a kilo of cocaine. It was suppressed.

I remember the argument they said what is this, the wild west? That was spoken by the judge from the Appellate Division. It's still the wild west in Brooklyn if this is allowed to be continued. They didn't even wait to get a Spanish speaking Detective with them to tell this family in their apartment we are here, we would like to come in, we would like to see if your son is here.

1 They are in the apartment for an unknown 2 period of time before they could think maybe we should 3 find out if we should be here. They had opportunities galore. They had a Detective stationed out back in case 4 5 someone is going to jump out of a window, I suppose. They could have had a Spanish speaking officer with them 6 7 or on the phone. It was their own choosing to rush and 8 do this in haste and they shouldn't be excused. 9 Thank you counsel. Let me take a THE COURT: 10 few minutes. 11 (A short recess was taken.) 12 THE CLERK: Mr. Rivera is again present. 13 THE COURT: I'm ready to proceed with my 14 decision with respect to the hearing that was just 15 conducted. 16 A Wade, Huntley with the Payton issue hearings 17 were conducted before me. The Wade hearing dealt with 18 six lineups. The Huntley hearing dealt with an oral, written and video statement. And the Payton issue dealt 19 20 with a baseball hat, camouflage jacket and -- I'm sorry, 21 what was the other piece? 22 MS. CHU: Hooded sweatshirt. 23 THE COURT: Sweatshirt, jacket and hat that 24 were recovered from the parents' apartment of the 25 Defendant while the Defendant wasn't present.

The People called three witnesses. I want to begin by indicating that I found all three of the People's witnesses to be credible.

First witness called was Detective John

Darino, an investigating Detective from the 72 Detective

Squad. He testified that on February 27th, 2005 he was

in the confines of the 72 precinct. He received a

notification of a homicide at El Borinquen Bar at 314

39th Street. He was assigned as the case Detective at

0800 hours. He spoke with witnesses. I don't know if

it was at the scene or not who indicated to him that

Kekay was the person who committed the homicide.

Kekay has been identified as the Defendant. He was the person identified as the perpetrator of the crime.

At 2050 or 8:50 p.m. a photo array was created. Confidential witness, identified as confidential witness number six viewed the photo array. It was shown to that person at 9:10 p.m. the witness recognized number 2 as the person who committed the crime. Number 2 was the photo of the Defendant.

The statement made was he was the male punching and swinging hands at the person who was stabbed.

The copy of the photo array was introduced as

People's 1 in evidence for purpose of the hearing. The Court viewed the photo array and there was nothing unduly suggestive in the photo array, none of the photographs seemed to suggest that the police had already made a selection of one of the photographs.

On 2/28/05 information was received that the Defendant was at 172-18 Effington Avenue in Flushing,

New York. This Detective or this witness went to that location with Detective Gaynor at 4:20 a.m. it was a private house, detached. A Patricia Glasgow opened the door. They had arrived at approximately five a.m. the Defendant was on the couch. He was arrested, brought to the 72 precinct interview room.

At 5:15 a.m. he spoke with -- this witness spoke with the Defendant in the interview room. He testified that Detective Gaynor was with him. He read Miranda warnings to the Defendant. Copy of the warnings that were read were introduced as People's 2 in evidence for purpose of the hearing.

The Court had an opportunity to review that
Miranda warnings sheet. Defendant wrote that he
understands or marked a yes with his initials next to
all of the questions on the Miranda warnings sheet, also
signed the bottom of the sheet. Afterwards, he orally
agreed to speak with the officers.

He indicated in sum and substance that he went to the bar, there was a small confrontation, there was a guy looking at him in a crowded room, crowd rose, he took out a knife and used it in self-defense. He swung it at the crowd in self-defense.

The Defendant was then asked to write down a statement. That statement was introduced into evidence as People's 3 for purpose of the hearing. The Court had an opportunity to review that statement. It was signed by the Defendant. Ten a.m. 2/28/05, the Defendant, approximately five hours after he was brought to the precinct spoke with an Assistant District Attorney and made a videotaped recording. That tape was introduced into evidence as number 4. The Court viewed the tape. The Defendant was read his rights on the tape and he indicated "we here" as a response to that recitation of rights prior to giving the videotaped statement.

This witness testified that lineups were conducted. The Defendant was the subject of the lineups. Six people were contacted and brought to the precinct to view the lineups. Numbers five and six or confidential witnesses five and six were picked up by the Police Department and brought there. Number one through number four came of their own accord. They were all placed in different rooms except for five and six

who came together who were seated together prior to the viewing.

The Defendant was in a room that was separated from those who were brought to view the witnesses. The Defendant was in the viewing room/interview room the entire time he was in the precinct. He could not be seen by witnesses prior to the lineup. Fillers were obtained; two from the neighborhood, three police officers. Police officers who were used as fillers were not seen by the witnesses. Photograph of the lineup was introduced as People's number 5 in evidence for purpose of the hearing. The Court had an opportunity to view the lineup photographs. The Defendant had chosen position number 4 in the lineup.

At 4:18 p.m. witness number one viewed the lineup, picked out number 4, said he's the guy from the bar, the guy who stabbed the victim.

Number two viewed the lineup, picked number 4, said he's the guy who punched the kid.

Number three picked number 4, the Defendant, of course, being number 4 and said that's the stabber.

Number four viewed the lineup and was unable to make an identification.

Number five viewed the lineup and picked number 4 also, the Defendant, and said that's Enrique.

JB

Number six viewed the lineup, picked number 4, also the Defendant, said that's the guy swinging his arms and punching the victim.

Witnesses once again did not meet before the lineup. They all left through the side door after they had an opportunity to view the lineup.

The witness testified that the Defendant had been fed on several occasions, was given drink continuously during the time he was in custody.

Between each lineup the Defendant had been asked whether or not he wanted to change seats. That was the sum and substance of the testimony of the Detective.

The second witness called by the People,

Detective James Gaynor testified that he works for

Brooklyn South Homicide, he has been a New York City

police officer for twenty years. On 2/27/05 he went to

speak with the Defendant, at 2/27/05 at one a.m. at 30

Bush Street, apartment ten. He went to the Defendant's

mother's residence. She could not speak English. He

was with Detective Darino. He testified that the mother

let him into the residence. Upon entering the residence

he saw a jacket camouflage, an army hat, brown

sweatshirt all on the floor.

Detective Rivera was contacted by this

Detective, phone was given to the mother of the

Defendant. She spoke with Detective Rivera. Detective

Rivera asked her if she knew where her son was and asked

if it would be okay if the police who were in the

apartment took the clothing.

Then it was indicated by Detective Rivera consent was given to take the clothing. The witness took the clothing and vouchered it at the precinct.

30 Bush Street was a project, an apartment building. There was no warrant to search these premises.

That was the sum and substance of what that Detective testified to.

The third witness was Detective Hector Rivera. He testified he has been a New York City Police

Department Detective -- that he is a New York City

Police Department Detective. He has been on the Police

Department for nineteen years. He works out of the 72

precinct. On 2/28/05 at one a.m. he spoke with

Detective Gaynor. He had been in another apartment at the time searching for the Defendant. He spoke on his cell phone. He said he had a conversation with the

Defendant's mother in Spanish. He asked her about where the Defendant was and also about whether or not the police could take the clothing from the apartment.

He indicated that the witness said that the police could take the clothing from the apartment. He testified she gave him permission to take the clothing; that she said Detective Gaynor could take the clothing. She said she didn't know where the Defendant was.

That was the People's case with respect to the hearing, direct case, at which time the Defendant called two witnesses for purposes of the hearing; Miss Anna Casallas and Carlos Casallas.

Insofar as both witnesses indicated they spoke a little bit of English, I found that to be credible.

As far as both witnesses indicated that they were related to the Defendant, I found that to be credible.

As far as both witnesses testified that they were frightened at the arrival of their apartment by the police, I find that to be credible.

There were other portions of the testimony that I found to be less than forthright. I'm not totally convinced as to whether or not they gave the police permission to enter the apartment and I'm not totally convinced that they didn't give police permission to take the clothing, although one testified that they didn't give permission to take the clothing.

I found the first witness, Miss Casallas, to be evasive with respect to several points that were

directly asked to her by the Court, somewhat evasive in any event. The fact that she is the mother of the Defendant is certainly something the Court is going to consider when judging the testimony of the witness as a whole.

In any event, regardless of the complete credibility of the witness' testimony, I'm not convinced that she came in here and completely lied about everything that she said. I do think, as I indicated, there were some portions in her testimony where she was either less than candid or somewhat evasive. That being said, at no point during her testimony did she indicate that the police in any way forced themselves into the apartment; that she strenuously or in any way asked them to leave once they were in the apartment and the same is true with respect to Mr. Carlos Casallas, the stepfather.

During the course of his testimony he indicated he never gave police permission to enter the apartment or to take the clothing, but at no time did he testify he told them to leave the apartment once they were there. He actually indicated at no point did he even know who they were; that I find to be somewhat incredulous. I can't imagine a group of police officers or people would enter a person's apartment, stay there,

take property and the person who owned the apartment would have no idea what they, in fact, were doing in the apartment.

Miss Casallas indicated she did have a conversation with Detective Rivera. I can't imagine she had a conversation with Detective Rivera and at that point was unaware that Detective Rivera was a police officer, although she strenuously insisted she didn't know these were police officers. I find that to be incredulous. I can't imagine that either of these witnesses didn't know who the people who came into the apartment were at that time in the morning dressed the way they were. As I indicated, at no point did either witness testify that they asked these people to leave.

In any event, that is the findings of fact with respect to this hearing.

With respect to my conclusions of law I'm going to begin with the fact that at pretrial hearing to suppress evidence obtained as a result of an alleged illegal arrest it's the People's burden to demonstrate the legality of the police conduct in the first instance. I'm going to cite People's versus Wise at 42 NY2d 321 page 329. A lot of other cases support that proposition.

The Defendant however does bear the ultimate

burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence the credible evidence that the evidence should not be used against him and that the police lacked probable cause to arrest the Defendant. I'm going to cite People versus Berrios at 28t NY2d 367, People versus Baldwin 25 NY2d 66 page 70 and People versus Milhouse at 246 AD2d 119 page 123. Probable cause to arrest only requires information which would lead a reasonable person who possesses the same expertise as the arresting officer to conclude that under the circumstances that the suspect about to be arrested is about to or has committed a crime. There's a lot of cases that support that proposition.

Before me the first issue I want to deal with is the Wade hearing. When a Defendant seeks suppression of physical evidence and has put forward sufficient factual allegations to warrant a pretrial hearing, that Defendant bears the ultimate burden of proving that the evidence should not be used against him. Once again citing Berrios, page 367. Although a Defendant carries the burden of proof in a suppression hearing the People are nevertheless put to the burden of going forward to show the legality of the conduct of the police in the first instance.

Now, with regard to the Wade issues, the

purpose of a Wade hearing is to determine whether a police conducted pretrial identification procedure was unduly and impermissibly suggestive so as to deny the Defendant his due process rights.

Now the People have the initial burden of going forward to establish the reasonableness of the police conduct and the lack of any undue suggestiveness in a pretrial identification procedure. The Defendant once again bears the ultimate burden of proving that such procedure was unduly suggestive.

Now in this case a photographic display was used. Now, a photographic display is suggestive only where some characteristic of one of the pictures draws the viewer's attention to that picture indicating that the police have made a particular selection. I'll cite People versus Cherry at 150 AD2d 475 and People versus Dubois at 140 AD2d 619, page 622.

I examined the photographic array employed in this case and I found it was not suggestive. In light of the indication law there was nothing about any of the pictures that drew the viewer's attention indicating the police had made a particular selection. The Defendant's appearance and clothes did not differ greatly from the men in the other photographs. They all seemed to this viewer as being close in age, similar hairstyles, skin

tones and facial characteristics, meeting the criteria set forth in People versus Robert 184 AD2d 597. That was repeated in People versus Floyd 173 AD2d 211.

Now, with respect to the lineup in this case the Defendant also contends that the evidence of the lineup identification should be suppressed because the difference with respect to facial characteristics, etc. of the participants or that the lineup procedure in general would have rendered that procedure unduly suggestive. While participants in a lineup should share general physical characteristics, and that is People versus Jackson at 211 AD2d 744, there is no requirement that a Defendant in a lineup be surrounded by people who are nearly identical in appearance.

There are a lot of cases, starting with People versus Chip 75 NY2d 327 page 336 and many other cases that support that proposition.

Now, this Court examined the photographs of the lineup which were introduced into evidence for purpose of the hearing and I conclude that the lineup was not unduly suggestive. The fillers, although not perfect, were similar in appearance to the Defendant.

The lineup constituted a fairly representative panel and any witness viewing it could make a reliable identification. I also found the procedures utilized by

the police in conducting the lineup were not unduly suggestive. Criteria put forward in People versus Caban 181 AD2d page 787.

Based on all the facts and circumstances presented in this case the Defendant's motion to suppress lineup identifications are hereby denied.

Finally or secondly, a Huntley hearing was conducted at which time the People again would have the burden of establishing that the Defendant voluntarily waived his prejudice against self-incrimination. To be valid an accused waiver of his or her rights must be knowingly and intelligently made the Court must always ascertain whether the Defendant understood how Miranda rights affected the custodial interrogation.

An individual may validly waive Miranda rights so long as the immediate import of those warnings is comprehended, regardless of his or her ignorance of mechanics by which the fruits of that waiver may be used later in the criminal process, as the Court of Appeals stated in People versus Sirno 76 NY2d 967 from page 968.

Where a Defendant indicates he understands his Miranda rights and promptly after having been administered those rights willingly proceeds to make a statement or answer questions during interrogation no other indication prior to the commencement of

interrogation is necessary to support a conclusion that the Defendant waived those rights. Also, federal case, North Carolina versus Butler at 441 US 369 and New York companion, People versus Davis 55 NY2d 731, a different People versus Davis than was cited by counsel earlier to support a different proposition that I'll be addressing immediately after this.

I found that the Defendant in this case willingly proceeded to make a statement and answer questions during interrogation and no other indication prior to commencement of that interrogation is necessary by this Court to support the conclusion that he waived his rights.

That aside, he indicated when he said "we here" after answering yes to all the questions the Court found that was, in fact, a waiver of his rights because he proceeded to answer all the questions asked of him.

earlier, approximately two hours earlier he signed a
Miranda warnings sheet and then made an oral and written
statement after that. So it's within two hours of being
already read his Miranda warnings there was no argument
of there not being any form of continuation.

Therefore, the application to suppress three statements is hereby denied, although I do want to notes

for the record that he did say "we here" as was pointed out by counsel, gratefully pointed out because the Court was under the misimpression that he had said yes so I was glad counsel pointed that out so I could view that again. However, it doesn't change the ultimate ruling that the Defendant knowingly and voluntarily waived his rights and proceeded to give those statements after having been formally read.

That brings us to the final issue, I suspect the most complicated which faced us and caused the Court concern because it had to do with several factors, one being a determination of the credibility of the witnesses, which I think I made clear during the course of my recitation. But also it gave the Court some pause because I believe it was necessary to review more importantly the law concerning what was before me.

Now, the first question that I have deals with standard. I'm going to address that issue, but I'm going to move ahead once I've addressed that issue. One seeking standing to assert a violation of his fourth amendment rights must demonstrate a legitimate expectation of privacy. One may have an expectation of privacy in premises not one's own or a familial or other socially recognized relationship. However, as the undisturbed findings of the trial court, that's me,

demonstrate the Defendant only had a relatively tenuous tie to the apartment where the property, which is the subject of this, what would be considered a Payton hearing was recovered.

The Defendant, it was clear was, as is cited in the case I'm going to quote from now, People versus Ortiz 83 NY2d 840, reading from the first page that I have. A Defendant who is a casual visitor to an apartment and would not have any reasonable expectation of privacy within the apartment, especially if they didn't have any expectation of privacy on the date of arrest.

The fact that there is only a tenuous relationship with the apartment, as was testified by the mother and the father or the stepfather of the Defendant called by the defense, would indicate to me that he stayed there now and then, once in a while he came and went from the apartment, but there was no indication that he lived there or that he even stayed there for any extended period. The testimony was that he came in, changed his clothes and left.

So with respect to the issue of standing, although not raised tangentially, I suspect raised by the prosecution, the Court addresses that issue now and finds that were that to be the primary concern before me

I'd have to find that there was no standing to even contest the taking into custody of the items that were taken into custody. That aside, the Court will address the Payton issue in any event.

There is a case I want to cite dealing with the issue of standing, People versus Manuel Hornedo. I just have it's a Second Department, November 1, 2000 case. The indictment number is 7943 of 1999. This case is exactly on point where a Defendant contends that the police unlawfully arrested him in his mother's apartment. The court held that they agree with the hearing court that the Defendant failed to demonstrate that he had a legitimate expectation of privacy in his mother's apartment. The Defendant lived at another location at the time of the arrest. He acknowledged that he stayed at the other location.

In this case not only do we have testimony that the Defendant didn't live in the apartment, but he was, in fact, arrested at another address.

So once again, that case would support the fact that there was, in fact, no standing to suppress the items.

That aside I'm going to now move into the Payton issue that was litigated in any event.

I would like to cite the case of People versus

Velez. The best cite I have is 4 Misdemeanor Third at 1004(a) in brackets. It's a May 12th, 2004 Bronx county case. This case cites People versus Gonzales at 39 NY2d 122 dealing with People versus Payton 445 US 573.

It indicated in Gonzales that the Court of Appeals examined several factors which may influence one's voluntary consent to a search. Those factors include whether the subject of the search was in police custody, what the subject's background was, whether the subject was evasive or cooperative with law enforcement authorities, whether the police advised the subject of his right to refuse consent, etc.

Accordingly, any determination regarding the Defendant will turns upon the totality of circumstances presented on the record and since Gonzales, Appellate courts have found consent to enter one's home by analyzing the occupant's words and it should be stressed conduct when dealing with the police.

AD2d 211. Where consent was found where a Defendant's companion left the front door open and then walked over to the Defendant and then the police then followed that person inside. Also, People versus Satorino 153 AD2d 595. The Appellate Division found there was no Payton violation where the Defendant's mother told detectives

that her son was in his room and then pointed to that direction when not indicating not giving them specific permission to enter.

More on point, I want to cite People versus
Davis, also cited in this case. This was a case brought
to my attention by the prosecutor 120 AD2d 606. I have
a copy of that case here too. Basically, it says
occupants acts of stepping aside to let officers in is
tantamount to consent. Consequently, when the
government claims to have been given consent to enter
one's home, an occupant's failure then to object to the
entry supports the conclusion of implicit permission to
enter. It indicates that that stepping aside when
people walk in is implicit permission to enter. The
Appellate Division upheld the police conduct in that
particular instance.

Also People versus Schoff 136 AD2d 578.

Consent was upheld where after entering premises occupants neither asked the police to leave nor objected to their presence. Also People versus Long 124 AD2d 1016. Occupants' cooperation with police was evidence of voluntary consent to enter. While it's unclear why Defendant's encounters with the police progressed into someone's home, a Defendant's failure to object to officers presence supports a court's finding that there

was, in fact, no Payton violation. And in this case as opposed to a Defendant we have a witness. So a witness' failure to object, but then going back to the witness, as opposed to Defendant, once again returns us to the issue of standing.

Let's just make it clear we are talking about a general Payton issue as opposed to there being standing or not being standing.

I would like to cite People versus Davis itself. I would like to quote from People versus Davis itself. Consent can be established by conduct as well as words.

Davis cites People versus Abrams 95 AD2d 155 from page 175. Also cites United States versus Griffin at 530 Fed2d 739. It also says the Defendants mother's conduct in stepping aside from the door to admit the officers is enough to establish consent. People versus Taylor 111 AD2d 520 489 New York supp. 2d 394.

I think that is pretty clear that the mother stepped aside and let the police in. Even the mother's testimony was that she stepped aside or stepped back and let the police enter the apartment. I think it's pretty clear in light of the case law.

There are other cases I want to cite, People versus Ayala Second Department 165 AD2d 878. Also

citing that stepping aside without saying anything is not a violation. The officers can enter the apartment, make an arrest and advise someone of their Miranda rights without having a Payton violation. Also People versus Washington at 209 AD2d 817, a Third Department case indicating that stepping aside and failing to direct the police to leave was tacit admissions of the police or consent of the police to enter the apartment.

In this case testimony alone demonstrated that the person tacitly consented to the officers' entry by conduct, that conduct being stepping aside and failing to direct the people to leave or otherwise indicate after they have already entered that there was no permission to stay.

Finally, People versus Schoff once again at 136 AD2d 578 and 71 NY2d 1033 also indicating failure to direct police to leave the premises on entry passively grants the police permission.

In this case, although there is some question as to whether or not the police officers were actually given permission or not, there is no doubt that there was a phone conversation between Officer Rivera and the mother and the mother didn't tell Officer Rivera in Spanish that she wanted everybody to leave. She simply indicated she had a conversation with the police

1 officer, Detective on the other end of the phone. There 2 is no testimony, although many opportunities, to request 3 them to leave could have been made; it was never taken. 4 These people who testified did not indicate 5 that they in any way asked the officers to leave after 6 they entered. They did say unequivocally that they 7 didn't give them permission to enter. 8 The facts and circumstances as determined by 9 this Court indicate that there was no, in fact, Payton 10 violation and counsel's application, even if they had 11 standing to suppress these items, is hereby denied. Your exception is noted counsel, I'm sure. 12 13 Tomorrow morning 10:30. 14 MR. DRANOVE: One last point; I don't know what 15 your take on it would be. Since no more money is 16 available --17 THE COURT: We will take that up tomorrow. 18 While waiting for the jury panel to be brought 19 up be prepared to proceed with Sandoval and Antonmarchi. 20 MR. DRANOVE: Can I get an idea of the 21 prosecution witness list? 22 THE COURT: I don't have it now. We will go 23 over it all together so we can evaluate. 24 MR. DRANOVE: I still have issues about 25 identity of witnesses.

1	THE COURT: Tomorrow morning. Same bail
2	conditions. Was Defendant given Parker warnings?
3	MR. DRANOVE: It's going to be hard for him to
4	run.
5	THE COURT: I want him to know if he does
6	voluntary absent himself by not coming tomorrow we will
7 8	proceed in his absence. We have had that issue.
8	MR. DRANOVE: This gentleman looks forward to
9	being here.
10	THE COURT: Good.
11	(Whereupon, the case was adjourned to June 7,
12	2006.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	THE COURT: Tomorrow morning. Same bail
2	conditions. Was Defendant given Parker warnings?
3	MR. DRANOVE: It's going to be hard for him to
4	run.
5	THE COURT: I want him to know if he does
6	voluntary absent himself by not coming tomorrow we will
7	proceed in his absence. We have had that issue.
8	MR. DRANOVE: This gentleman looks forward to
9	being here.
10	THE COURT: Good.
11	(Whereupon, the case was adjourned to June 7,
12	2006.)
13	
14	* * * *
15	
16	
17	It is hereby certified that the
18	foregoing is a true and accurate
19	transcript of the proceedings.
20	
21	A Borra
22	U FILLS
23	JUDITH BRUSCA
24	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
0.5	

District Attorney, Kings County
BY: PHYLLIS CHU, ESQ.
Assistant District Attorney

JOEL K. DRANOVE, ESQ.
299 Broadway, #706
New York, New York 10007
Attorney for Defendant

Maria E. Gordon, R.P.R.

Official Court Reporter

20

21

22

23

24

25

COURT CLERK: This is 1453/2005: It's the other 1 case on trial Enrique Rivera. Mr. Rivera is present. 2 Could we have counsel give their appearance. 3 The People are present, the jury is not. 4 THE COURT: I have a document in front of me. 5 It's entitled Jury Note. The time of the note is 6 2:30 p.m. It's been shown to both counsel. The date is 7 6/27/06. My name is stamped to the note. It's signed by 8 the foreperson. It's been marked Court Exhibit Number 13. 9 The body of the note reads as follows "Your 10 Honor, may we have the copy of the definitions for the 11 verdicts and direct and circumstantial evidence." That 12 was brought into the jury room. "Pictures inside bar." 13 That was brought into the jury room. "Testimony of DNA 14 expert." 15 It's my intention to bring the panel in and have 16 the court reporter read the testimony of the DNA expert. 17 It runs approximately 22 pages. Any objection, counsel? 18 MS. CHU: No. 19 THE COURT: Counsel? 20 MR. DRANOVE: No, sir. 21 COURT OFFICER: Ready for the jury? 22 THE COURT: Yes, please. 23 (WHEREUPON, the jury returned to the jury box 24 and the following proceedings takes place before the Court 25

	PROCEEDINGS
1	and jury as follows:)
2	COURT OFFICER: All twelve deliberating jurors
3	are now present. Both sides waive the reading of roll?
4	MS. CHU: Yes.
5	MR. DRANOVE: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Thank you. I have a document in
7	front of me. It's entitled Jury Note. It's signed by the
8	foreperson. Again, I'm getting to know this signature
9	very well. It's Court Exhibit Number 13. My name is
10	stamped to the note. The body of the note reads as
11	follows "Your Honor, may we have a copy of the definitions
12	for the verdicts and direct and circumstantial evidence."
13	I know that was brought in to the jury room.
14	Plus "pictures inside the bar." I know that was brought
15	into the jury room and "the testimony of the DNA expert."
16	Maria is going to read that to you now.
17	(WHEREUPON, the requested portion of the record
18	is read by the court reporter)
19	THE COURT: You're dismissed to continue
20	deliberation.
21	(WHEREUPON, the jury exits the courtroom and the
22	following proceedings takes place before the Court as
23	follows:)

follows:) THE COURT: The jury's out of the room.

door is closed. Folks, stick around for a little while.

24

25

Case 1:15-cv-02657-EK Document 9 Filed 12/08/15 Page 123 of 308 PageID #: 232

PROCEEDINGS

(WHEREUPON, a recess is taken, after which the following proceedings commence before the Court as follows:)

COURT CLERK: This is 14153/2005 Enrique Rivera who is present with counsel, the People are present, the deliberating jury is not.

THE COURT: I have a document that is in front of me. It's entitled Jury Note. The time is 4:40 p.m.

The date is 6/27/06. My name is stamped on the note.

It's been signed by the foreperson. It will be marked

Court Exhibit Number 14. I believe it's 14. The body of the note reads --

COURT CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: The body of the note reads as follows "Your Honor, after five and a half days of much discussion and review of the court exhibits and reading of the court testimonies, opinions remain unchanged and we cannot come to a unanimous decision." Counsel?

MS. CHU: Hang them.

MR. DRANOVE: Your Honor, I respectfully request to inquire of the jury as to whether they are able to come to a unanimous decision about any of the counts.

They have had an extraordinarily amount of time and perhaps they have, and that, I believe, is, in all fairness, something that is neutral and just that request

should be granted.

THE COURT: I'm going to read two sections of the criminal procedure law Section 310.60 "Discharge of Jury before Rendition of a Verdict and Effect Thereof"

Section 1A. In Section 1 "A deliberating jury may be discharged by the Court without having rendered the verdict only when (a) the jury has deliberated for an extensive period of time without agreeing upon a verdict with respect to any of the charges submitted and the Court is satisfied that any such agreement is unlikely within a reasonable time, (b) the Court, the defendant, and the People all consent to such discharge, (c) a mistrial is declared pursuant to Section 280.10."

Section 2 "When a jury is so discharged, the defendant or defendants may be retried upon the indictment. Upon such retrial, the indictment is deemed to contain all counts which it contained, except those which were dismissed or would deemed to have resulted in acquittal pursuant to subdivision one of Section 290.10."

Section 310.70 deals with the Rendition of
Partial Verdict and Effect Thereof. "1. If a deliberating
jury declares that it has reached a verdict with respect
to one or more but not all of the offenses submitted to it
or with respect to one or more but not all of the
defendants, the Court must proceed as follows (a) if the

PROCEEDINGS

possibility of ultimate agreement with respect to the other submitted offenses or defendants is so small and the circumstances is such that if they were the only matters under consideration the Court would be authorized to discharge the jury pursuant to Paragraph A of subdivision one, Section 310.60, the Court must terminate the deliberation and order the jury to render a partial verdict with respect to those offenses and defendants upon which or with respect to whom it has reached a verdict, (b) if the Court is satisfied that there is a reasonable possibility of an ultimate agreement upon any of the unresolved offenses with respect to any of the defendant it may either --" I'm not going to read those two sections, but it deals with continuing rendering a verdict and continuing deliberation.

Subdivision two of 310.70 indicates as follows "Following the rendition of a partial verdict pursuant to subdivision one, the defendant may be --" and then it sets forth what the defendant may do, the operative section, and there's other sections or one other section dealing with submitted offenses, what submitted offenses means, but that doesn't really have any impact on what we have before us.

Now, your request is to take a partial verdict.

MR. DRANOVE: No. To ask them if they've

PROCEEDINGS

reached a partial verdict to determine if there have been
a compliance with the very first subsection that you read
because you haven't asked the jury to report if they
reached an agreement upon a verdict upon any charge.

THE COURT: Just to show that I -- not only do I disagree with you but you're wrong. I'm going to read Section 310.70(1) again. "If a deliberating jury declares --" and I don't think I could be more emphatic than that. This jury has not declared --

MR. DRANOVE: Then ask them whether they have.

THE COURT: Counsel, would you please, don't interrupt "--that it has reached a partial verdict with respect to one or more but not all of the offenses, then the Court must proceed in a specific way."

This jury has not under any aspect indicated that it has declared that it has reached a verdict with respect to one or any of the counts.

MR. DRANOVE: Your Honor, I submit that the jury doesn't have a copy of the CPL nor anyone guiding them what they are supposed to know -- what they're supposed to do if they've reached a partial verdict.

A verdict would be through the end of the verdict sheet, that's all, saying they cannot reach, I believe, and I don't understand your resistance in asking them if they reached a partial verdict.

PROCEEDINGS

If my client has or has not been acquitted of one or two of the charges, he should know it, Your Honor should know it, the People of the State of New York should know it.

I don't understand the hesitation when they were not asked by Your Honor to report as to whether or not they've reached a partial verdict.

THE COURT: Counsel?

MS. CHU: Your Honor, I would agree with the Court. I believe that the statute is quite clear that it's only when a jury has indicated that they have reached a partial verdict that the Court is to proceed in a certain manner.

There have been no indications whatsoever during the five and a half days that we've been with this jury that they've reached a verdict on any of the counts that's before them.

Not only that, they asked for all three of the counts to be given to them in writing, which indicates that they have not reached a verdict on anything, so I believe that it would be outside the boundary of what the Court is permitted to do to ask them a question of whether they have reached anything.

THE COURT: Not only do I agree with you but by submitting a question to the jury asking them whether they

PROCEEDINGS

can or have reached a partial verdict might imply to the jury that the Court is suggesting that they do, and I have no intention of doing that.

I don't want this jury to think that it's the Court's impression that they should reach at least a partial verdict, which would certainly be --

MR. DRANOVE: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- certainly be an avoidance of their duty in whole, and, secondly, it would be a mischaracter of justice to the community in the sense that I would be suggesting they have to reach at least some form of verdict and I don't want to pressure them to think that that would be the case. That's the fear of the Court and that's why, counsel, your objection is obviously noted.

MR. DRANOVE: Your Honor, do you actually believe that inquiry of the jury as to whether they reached a partial verdict is going to be anything more than an inquiry as to whether they've reached a partial verdict?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DRANOVE: I'm surprised you say so, Your Honor.

THE COURT: In any event, I have no obligation to ask that question. I have no indication from the jury

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS that they have reached a partial verdict in any way and it's my intention to bring in the jury and to declare a mistrial and dismiss this panel. COURT OFFICER: Are you ready for the jury now? THE COURT: Yes, please. (WHEREUPON, the jury returned to the jury box and the following proceedings takes place before the Court and jury as follows:) COURT CLERK: All 12 members of our deliberating jury is now present. Both sides waive the reading of the roll? MS. CHU: Yes. THE COURT: Counsel? MR. DRANOVE: Yes. THE COURT: Thank you. Now, I have a document

in front of me entitled Jury Note. The time is 4:30 p.m., the date is 6/27/06. It's been marked Court Exhibit Number 14. My name is stamped to the document.

It's been signed by the foreperson again and the body of the note reads as follows "Your Honor, after five and a half days of much discussion and review of the court exhibits and reading of court testimonies, opinions remain unchanged and we cannot come to a unanimous decision."

I'm going to dismiss the panel at this time.

MR. DRANOVE: Would you ask them if they reached

1	a partial verdict, Your Honor?
2	THE COURT: Sit down, counsel. I'm going to
3	dismiss the panel at this time and before I do I'm going
4	to just take a few minutes to thank you for all your time.
5	I know this is a very, very difficult situation.
6	I know you didn't shirk your responsibility, and I know
7	you worked very, very hard. Sometimes these things are
8	very, very hard to do.
9	Thank you in any event for your time. You're
10	all excused.
11	(WHEREUPON, the jury exits the courtroom and the
12	following proceedings takes place before the Court as
13	follows:)
14	THE COURT: When is the next day
15	MS. CHU: All right. Your Honor, the defense
16	counsel is asking the family members to go outside and try
17	and speak to the jury about partial verdicts.
18	THE COURT: The panel is dismissed.
19	MS. CHU: I think that what defense counsel did
20	during
21	THE COURT: Was near contemptuous but the Court
22	is going to excuse his zeal, but if it should happen again
23	at any time in the future, the Court will not be so
24	lenient. We've
25	MR. DRANOVE: Judge

THE COURT: Counsel, we've discussed this. We discussed this outside the earshot of the jury. The Court made its determination. It was uncalled for, especially someone with your professional reputation, your quality as an attorney, you know better than to have done that.

MR. DRANOVE: Perhaps the more reason I have that reputation is I take quite seriously, as you did, sir, when you were representing your clients, and as all in this courtroom who at one time did the need to zealously represent their client.

THE COURT: That's why I haven't held you in contempt for that contemptuous behavior.

In any event, I do understand your zeal,
counsel. I believe it was misplaced with that particular

In any event, we're going to need a day to retry this. What would be the most appropriate -- Both parties have received the minutes. That's not going to be an issue. We're going to move forward expeditiously.

MS. CHU: I have 2004 matter that's scheduled for trial on July 18th. I'm going to be away the first week of August. Sometime towards the end of August would be fine with me.

MR. DRANOVE: Judge, I look forward to August with one caveat. I have a firm date for federal trial on

September 11th, so -- He picked September 11th. 1 THE COURT: What about the July 5th? 2 MS. CHU: I'm going to be away that week. 3 THE COURT: When are you coming back? 4 MS. CHU: And I'm also riding the following week 5 after. 6 THE COURT: Can you change the riding situation? 7 MS. CHU: Everybody is pretty busy right now. 8 MR. DRANOVE: Judge, I'm extremely tied up with 9 Appellate Division deadlines. 10 THE COURT: No, I understand. The only point --11 The only reason because you just told me your schedules. 12 I'm not going to be here the last two weeks of August, so 13 that creates a real problem. You're going to be here the 14 last two weeks of July -- the two weeks in July. You 15 can't do this and then the first week in August is not 16 good. 17 Mr. Dranove, you're going to be on trial again 18 September 11th, so that's putting us in a bit of a bind. 19 If we can't do it right away then we can't do it for 20 awhile. 21 MS. CHU: What about towards the middle to end 22 of September after he's finished with his federal trial? 23 I should be able to do another trial in between there and 24 then I should be done by maybe the third week of 25

1	September.
2	THE COURT: Counsel, Mr. Dranove?
3	MR. DRANOVE: Judge, I am consulting with my
4	client. If you give me a a moment more I'll respond.
5	(WHEREUPON, there is an off-the-record
6	discussion, after which the following proceedings takes
7	place before the Court as follows:)
8	THE COURT: How about the week of the 18th?
9	MR. DRANOVE: Of which month?
10	THE COURT: September.
11	MR. DRANOVE: Your Honor, I think all I would be
12	able to report then is that I'm in the middle of a trial.
13	THE COURT: I know that and that may be that
14	may be possible but there's always the possibility.
15	MR. DRANOVE: For control date so we
16	THE COURT: What my intention is to have you try
17	this case right after that one.
18	MR. DRANOVE: Can I at least prepare for this
19	retrial. The fact that I've tried it once indicates
20	there's a voluminous amount to
21	THE COURT: You did such a good job, I must add
22	MR. DRANOVE: I beg your pardon?
23	THE COURT: You did such a good job at the first
24	trial. You seem to be well prepared already to move
25	ahead.

PROCEEDINGS MR. DRANOVE: Thank you, Judge. I take that as 1 a compliment. 2 THE COURT: So why don't we just take the 18th. 3 Use that as the day for trial. If you're actually 4 engaged, you're engaged. 5 MR. DRANOVE: We have a two-week trial coming up 6 7 there --THE COURT: Then you will be engaged. 8 MR. DRANOVE: -- in Mangano. My client has a 9 Somalian interpreter. The co-defendant's interpreter is 10 French. 11 It's going to be a very interesting trial and 12 supposedly two weeks, so then the 25th would be more 13 realistic. 14 15 16

THE COURT: Why don't we put it on for the 18th. You'll have a good idea on the 18th when you'll be able to try it. If you need a day or two in between, you will let me know.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'll be very, you know, happy to give you a practice day or two, but we've already done it and we already have the minutes and you have, you know, between now and then it's not like we need any further investigation; although, maybe you do.

MR. DRANOVE: I do, Your Honor, have a request. It's for you to reconsider your prior decision denying my

PROCEEDINGS

application for the contact information for all of the persons who were in the bar who did not see a knife in my client's hand. A limited number spoke at this trial. There are others who were in the bar. There are a bartender and bartendress who was interviewed whose contact information I don't have, particularly, in light of the fact we've all sat through the trial and understand the arguments.

I believe they are in deed exculpatory Brady evidence material witnesses and there's been no indication of why I should not be entitled to at least ask them if they'd like to speak to me or my investigator. I renew my application.

THE COURT: Counsel?

MS. CHU: Your Honor, I don't know which witnesses he's talking about. The witnesses, as far as I know, as far as the bartender and things alike, they didn't see what happened, so whether or not they saw a knife in his client's hands, I don't see how that would be relevant.

MR. DRANOVE: Well, we've tried the case. I don't have to reveal more of my trial strategy.

THE COURT: Were more DD-5's handed over to counsel at trial unredacted?

MS. CHU: With the exception of the addresses,

yeah. 1 2 THE COURT: With the exception of the addresses but all the names of all the witnesses? 3 MS. CHU: The names are all out there. 4 THE COURT: We're not talking about confidential 5 witness one, two, three up to six anymore. 6 7 MR. DRANOVE: But how do I contact them? MS. CHU: That is why you have an investigator. 8 THE COURT: Yeah. That's why you have an 9 investigator. I'm not going to order them to turn over 10 the addresses of the witnesses; that is, I'm not going to 11 do it. 12 MR. DRANOVE: How about phone numbers? Let me 13 just confirm phone numbers with Ms. Chu because --14 THE COURT: Counsel, I'm not going to order them 15 to turn over contact information. 16 Obviously, investigators have a lot of abilities 17 to contact people in this day and age. People who were in 18 the bar, I quess, or people who worked for the bar, if you 19 have their names, I don't see it should be much of a 20 problem. 21 MR. DRANOVE: Judge, we have a bouncer named 22 Bebe. How do I contact Bebe? 23 MS. CHU: Ask your client. He's the only one 24 who knows -- Ask Mr. Rivera. He's the only one who knows 25

1	about a Bebe.
2	MR. DRANOVE: Luis Rivera May I have Luis
3	Rivera's NYSID number from the prosecution because I'm
4	convinced they're not going to call him for the retrial,
5	and I would like the Court to sign an order to produce him
6	for the retrial.
7	THE COURT: Counsel, you get me an order to
8	produce and I'l sign it.
9	MR. DRANOVE: I will ask for the NYSID number
10	and his location to be provided to me by Ms. Chu.
11	MS. CHU: Your Honor, his client is
12	incarcerated. I would not want to have any incident occur
13	in jail while he knows the witness' NYSID number and where
14	he's actually held.
15	I refuse to give over that information under the
16	guise of, you know, we heard from that witness himself
17	that there were threats that were being put around that he
18	is a snitch and what have you when he actually testified.
19	MR. DRANOVE: Where did you hear that?
20	MS. CHU: From his attorney.
21	THE COURT: His attorney?
22	MR. DRANOVE: Oh, well, I'm not privy to any of
23	that.
24	THE COURT: Yeah, you were. You were actually
25	standing right here.

1	MR. DRANOVE: I didn't hear it.
2	THE COURT: Then you didn't hear it, but you
3	were standing right here.
4	Let the record reflect that I'm pointing to the
5	bench when he came up and told us.
6	MR. DRANOVE: I have I don't have that on the
7	record that I have and if
8	THE COURT: No, it was not on the record. We
9	didn't put that on the record.
10	MR. DRANOVE: In any event, I want to call that
11	person to the witness stand. He's testified.
12	THE COURT: Counsel, my advice, and I really
13	shouldn't be giving you advice from the bench, but
14	MR. DRANOVE: You're a learned jurist.
15	THE COURT: My advice to you would be to call
16	his lawyer and ask his lawyer for that information, and
17	I'm sure his lawyer will give it to you if he thinks it's
18	appropriate but he has a lawyer. Call his lawyer.
19	MR. DRANOVE: Is his lawyer's name in the
20	record? I don't
21	THE COURT: I'm sure it is.
22	MR. DRANOVE: I will look for it. If it's not,
23	I will notify Your Honor. We can take
24	THE COURT: We'll help you find his name.
25	MR. DRANOVE: Fine. Hold on a minute. Here it

Case 1:15-cv-02657-EK Document 9 Filed 12/08/15 Page 139 of 308 PageID #: 248 **PROCEEDINGS** is. 1 THE COURT: Mr. Quinn is the best. Step up. 2 It had just been discarded. I'm handing down Mr. Fredrick's 3 Legal Aid card to counsel. 4 MR. DRANOVE: Thank you. 5 THE COURT: And I guess you can contact Mr. 6 7 Fredrick and he'll help you out. MS. CHU: Thank you. 8 THE COURT: Thank you both. 9 (WHEREUPON, proceedings adjourned to 10 September 18, 2006) 11 *-*-*-*-*-*-* 12 I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and 13 accurate copy of the stenographic copy of the hearing held in 14 the above matter. 15 (Or trial as the case may be) 16 17 18 Official Court/Reporter 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF KINGS: CRIMINAL TERM: PT 35

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

- against -

Ind. #1453/05

ENRIQUE RIVERA,

Murder 2

Defendant. Sandoval Hrg Voir Dire

----x 320 Jay Street

Brooklyn, New York

May 4, 2009 and May 5, 2009

B E F O R E : HONORABLE ALAN MARRUS, presiding

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PEOPLE:

CHARLES HYNES, ESQ.

District Attorney - Kings County

210 Joralemon Street Brooklyn, New York BY: PHYLLIS CHU, ESQ.

Assistant District Attorney

FOR THE DEFT:

JOEL DRANOVE, ESQ. Brooklyn, New York

> MICHELE J. WALKER OFFICIAL SENIOR COURT REPORTER

	Motions	2
1	COURT CLERK: Indictment 1453, 2005.	
2	Enrique Rivera.	
3	THE COURT: Counsel, your appearances,	
4	please?	
5	MR. DRANOVE: Joel Dranove, D-R-A-N-O-V-E,	
6	for Mr. Rivera.	
7	MS. CHU: For the office of the District	
8	Attorney, Phyllis Chu.	
9	Good afternoon, your Honor.	
10	THE COURT: This case was sent to me for	
11	trial.	
12	Are the People ready?	
13	MS. CHU: Yes, your Honor. The People are	
14	ready.	
15	THE COURT: Is the Defense ready?	
16	MR. DRANOVE: Yes, your Honor.	
17	THE COURT: Then we move the case for	
18	trial.	
19	Mr. Rivera, I'm Judge Marrus, and I'm the	
20	judge that has been assigned to try your case.	
21	THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon.	
22	THE COURT: Good afternoon.	
23	Before we commence jury selection, I want	
24	to resolve all matters that need to be	
25	resolved. So let's start with the prosecution.	

Motions 3

Is there any ruling that you need from me before jury selection commences?

MS. CHU: Your Honor, I would just ask that there is one detective that is no longer available. He is retired, and we have tried several attempts at trying to locate him through his pension address and he has been unable to be located. That detective's name is Detective James O'Sullivan. For that reason, your Honor, this detective testified at the prior trial in 2006, before Judge Collini, and pursuant to CPLR, I believe, Section 670, People would be seeking to introduce his prior testimony in its entirety because of his unavailability.

THE COURT: Is there any objection by the Defense?

MR. DRANOVE: I have a question which -- with respect to the efforts to locate the detective.

Was anybody sent to his last known address to find out if he actually lives there?

THE COURT: Miss Chu, what efforts were made to locate him?

MS. CHU: I sent two letters to his

Motions 4

address, as well as one certified letter to him.

2.2

2.4

The first two letters were sent regular mail because sometimes when you send certified, it delays them actually being able to get it.

I also had a detective actually go to the location. The detective informed me that when he arrived there, there were no cars in the driveway. And it did not appear as though anyone lived in the house. All the lights were out. I don't recall what time of the day it was. But it did appear -- I'm sorry -- that there were computer checks that were done for this detective, and that is a legitimate address for him. However, it didn't appear as though anyone was residing in the apartment -- I'm sorry -- the address that was listed on his pension information.

MR. DRANOVE: I wonder, have the pension checks been cashed? Have they been returned to The City? If they're being negotiated, then that's his address.

Might be insufficient showing.

THE COURT: Miss Chu?

MS. CHU: I have no idea. I believe

Motions

there's some sort of privacy issues having to do with his pension checks. I'm not sure we can find out his finances whether or not he's cashing checks.

The efforts that I made to try and locate Detective O'Sullivan, I believe, are sufficient. To establish that he has been -- that we have been unable to locate him. I don't believe that going into pension checks and finding out that information, I don't know where we have the authority to do that.

THE COURT: Now, you said you sent two letters, and one was -- you also sent a certified --

MS. CHU: I also did send a certified letter. That has not been picked up. To date.

I sent one letter, I believe, beginning of March. The second letter was sent the beginning of April. Then I sent the certified letter, I think, about a week or two ago. And I have not heard anything back. He has not called.

I also asked detectives from his original command, Crime Scene Unit, to try and reach out to him, and they also have been unsuccessful in

Motions

trying to reach him.

THE COURT: Was the certified letter return receipt requested?

MS. CHU: Certified so that he has to sign for it, and we would know, whoever signed for it, that he got it.

I have not received anything saying anybody picked up the letter at all.

THE COURT: Well, it seems pretty clear that, you know, the People have made a reasonable effort to locate this detective and to get in touch with him by sending him numerous letters, including one certified and by sending a detective investigator out to his last known address. It would appear to me that this does satisfy the statutory requirements that the witness is unavailable to testify at this trial. And given the fact he was fully cross-examined, and the same counsel that was involved in that trial, I don't really see any prejudice to the defense regarding the scope of his testimony.

So I'll allow the People to perpetuate his prior testimony from the first trial at this trial. And that the testimony will be read

Antommarchi

from the transcript that was certified by the court reporter from the first trial.

Is there any other matter that the People need a ruling on before jury selection commences?

MS. CHU: Not at this time.

THE COURT: Mr. Dranove, do you need a ruling from me on anything?

MR. DRANOVE: No.

But I want the record to reflect that there will come a time when jury questioned and there may be a possibility that a juror may want to speak in confidence to The Court and counsel and my client would have a right, under the People versus Antommarchi case, to be present and I will discuss with him the possible decisions to be made and report back to The Court.

THE COURT: Well, I want to discuss one of those issues right now.

When we pick the jury, I expect everything to be on the record, and everything obviously will be in open court. However, every once a while there is a juror who does not want to answer a question asked by someone publicly.

Antommarchi

2.

And I want to know if that is going to be okay with your client if the juror wants to speak to me privately, with you and the DA present? But not him.

MR. DRANOVE: I will let you know before the questioning starts, your Honor. Whether my client wants to be present.

My recollection of the last trial is that we did not include my client, but that is three years ago. I am not certain I am accurate in that regard.

THE COURT: Well, it's probably an academic issue. In my part, the last juror that asked to speak to me privately was over a year ago. That is the last I can remember, the way I conduct jury selection.

However, there is possibility, if that happens, I need to know whether to tell the jury yes or no that the juror can speak to me privately or not.

All right, now there is a Sandoval application that has to be done before trial.

I am looking at a criminal history sheet. That indicates the defendant has a youthful offender adjudication in 1992 for Criminal Possession of

a Weapon in the Third Degree, a felony conviction for Attempted Robbery in the Second Degree in 1993 and a felony conviction for Criminal Sale of a Controlled Substance in the Third Degree in 1998. After that I only see a violation for harassment in 2004, which I won't allow any cross-examination about since it's violation. Are you aware of any other criminal record that your client has, Mr. Dranove, in this or any other jurisdiction?

MR. DRANOVE: No, sir.

THE COURT: And Miss Chu, are there any other bad acts, outside of this criminal history, that you would propose to cross-examine the defendant about if he takes the stand?

MS. CHU: I am not aware of any other prior bad acts other than what is listed on the rap sheet.

THE COURT: Mr. Dranove, I will hear you on this why I shouldn't allow the DA to ask your client about these criminal convictions, specifically the two felonies.

MR. DRANOVE: I think that the 1993 felony apparently the layperson and others would

Sandoval 10

consider a crime of violence. The indictment charges alternate violence as we know it. And it's an old, if not very old, conviction. I think the combination of the age of it and the fact that it's a violent crime, is such that it would prejudice the jury so that it would not be able to compartmentalize that this is just a criminal conviction, not indication of the defendant's nature.

And as to the other felony, the sale of drugs. I think it's not relevant to this crime whatsoever and nonviolent and now 11 years old.

My client has been in jail for sometime, of course. I think that the jury should hear the witness, whether it's my client or another, not have felony conviction in their mind as they wonder what to make of that felony conviction. He's a felon, why should I believe him?

So I am asking not to allow the prosecution to question my client with respect to the '92 youthful offender case or the '93 attempted robbery or the '98 sale of a controlled substance. Third degree.

THE COURT: Miss Chu?

MS. CHU: Yes, your Honor.

I believe that the defendant was incarcerated during that time period for four years. I believe he was committed in 1998, he did not get out until 2002. So four of those years he had spent incarcerated. So, therefore, it would toll the time under which, as far as the distance between 1992 or 1993 until the present time.

Obviously, he has been incarcerated since he was arrested on this case in 2005. Your Honor, I believe that would obviate the argument, or negate the argument, that it's too remote as far as that's concern. As far as time wise is concerned.

The People would not only like to inquire of the defendant, should he take the stand, regarding those convictions, but of the underlying fact which are on the first case of the attempted robbery in the second degree. He was arrested on October 7th, 1992, and on October 7th, 1992 the allegations, or the facts, or the underlying facts, of that case were that 5:10 p.m., in front 615 Mill Street, the defendant accosted a delivery person and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Sandoval 12

demanded money. When the victim refused, defendant took out a knife and put it to the victim's throat and goes through his pockets and takes out money. The defendant was apprehended based upon a point-out to the police, and that resulted in the attempted robbery in the second degree conviction, which resulted in the five year probation as a sentence.

In addition to that, your Honor the attempted sale of a controlled substance in the third degree conviction that he received in October of 1998, the underlying facts are that June 9 of 1997, at 1:10 p.m., the defendant, along with an apprehended other person by the name of Edward Irrizary, were approached by an undercover officer, and the undercover who had first approached the apprehended other, was led to the defendant who was inside of 11 Bush Street. Once the defendant saw the undercover come overhe opened the door to the building and reached over the door and got red glassines and asked the undercover how many he wanted. When the undercover asked for a dime, the defendant even clarified that they were actually nickel

Sandoval 13

bags. So he handed him one more glassine. So he got two glassines when the undercover gave him \$10 of pre-recorded buy money. At the time of the defendant's arrest, he was found in possession of buy money, as well as matching stash to the drugs that were sold to the undercover.

And while the defendant was out on bail in that case, he actually fled to Puerto Rico. He had to be extradited back to the United States.

The People would seek to inquire of the defendant, not only of the convictions, but of the underlying facts.

With regard to the robbery conviction, I understand that in this case he also had a knife. However, there is case law, I believe it's Rahming, that holds that a defendant should be allowed to use, if he uses the same m.o. on cases to use that as a shield to prevent him from being cross-examined should he take the stand. And although he did brandish the knife in that case and alleged to have used the knife in this case, he can use that as a shield anymore to prevent himself from being questioned regarding that.

1	So, for all those reasons, the People
2	would ask that we be allowed to ask about not
3	only the convictions, but the underlying facts.
4	MR. DRANOVE: May I respond?
5	THE COURT: You may.
6	(pause)
7	THE COURT: Go ahead.
8	MR. DRANOVE: I am starting to recommend
9	similar arguments last time. I remind Miss
10	Chu, as I informed her last time, one doesn't
11	get extradited from Puerto Rico, it's actually
12	part of the United States. I think the last
13	time she called it another country.
14	And this is not a similar m.o. case. With
15	respect to an attempted robbery. This is just
16	about a frightful incident, and the decedent,
17	argument apart from that, already has been
18	placed before your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Balancing the factors which I
20	must, I'll allow the People to ask the
21	defendant two questions if he takes the stand:
22	The first is, on October 7 th , 1998, were
23	you convicted of a felony? On October 7, 1998,
24	were you convicted of a felony?

And the second question is, on

25

September 3rd, 1993, were you convicted of another felony? On September 3rd, 1993 were you convicted of another felony?

If he truthfully answers those two questions a yes, that will bar any further questioning about the crimes or the underlying facts.

If he were to deny that he was convicted, or try to explain or mitigate them in any way beyond a yes answer, that will open the door to cross-examination about what the crimes were and any underlying facts.

MS. CHU: That brings me to my next application.

During the last trial, the defense -- I am sorry. The Court ruled, similarly with your Honor, with respect to the facts that I could question the defendant, should he take the stand, whether he was convicted of a felony. During that time, during Sandoval ruling on the prior case, the court admonished counsel, that means you're not allowed to ask the defendant, you know, you pled guilty on those cases and therefore you're testifying on this, so, therefore, implying to the jury that somehow

you pled guilty because you were guilty in those cases and you're only testifying on this case because you're, in fact, innocent on this case.

Despite those admonitions to the defense counsel, the defense counsel asked the defendant, and he testified during the prior trial that, yes, he had pled guilty on those prior cases, and he says this is the first time that he was actually testifying on this case.

On any case that he had ever had. So I made an application, and although the court's decision agreed, I felt that that crossed the line and that opened the door for me to be able to ask him about the underlying facts of those felonies.

Now I am asking The Court, because of the fact that this has happened before when we tried the case before, that again Defense be admonished or warned that they are not to try and imply to this jury, or suggest to this jury, that the only reason why he is testifying now is because he's, in fact, innocent, when he took those pleas on other cases it was because they guilty on those cases. I think it's an

unfair picture to paint to the jury. It's unfair to the justice system. I think that that should not be allowed.

THE COURT: Mr. Dranove. If you're not going to ask that question at this trial, I think it's my application --

MR. DRANOVE: I will not ask that question at this trial.

THE COURT: All right. So it's clear the question is simply, were you convicted of a felony each time? If yes is the answer, and that's it. Nothing else about this. All right. We've got to keep it at that level.

Any other explanation or comment about it is going to be viewed as a violation of my ruling.

MR. DRANOVE: This raises an issue which I'd like to address.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DRANOVE: If my client testifies, I imagine he may be cross-examined with respect to prior testimony he's given. Does The Court -- does The Court yet have any idea what it might instruct the jury with respect to why it is that we're hearing --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

18

THE COURT: It's common when there is a retrial, there may be a lot of witnesses who are questioned about their prior testimony. And so counsel are instructed to refer their questions to, "at a prior proceeding." And not use the word "trial." "You remember testifying at a prior proceeding" and then going forward and asking the question, and answer now was at that time, keep it at that level. I don't think there's any prejudice to anyone in saying that there was some sort of prior proceeding at which people gave an account. I think that is the best way to handle it, and, of course, I would instruct counsel to admonish your witness, prosecution witnesses or defense witnesses, that they are not to mention that there was a prior trial when they testified. It's conceivable that a witness might volunteer that information in response to some question, and they need to be told before they testify, whatever you say, don't refer to the fact that you were previously here at another trial or gave testimony at another trial. They are not to say that to avoid any possible prejudice.

All right, now is there any other matter

that you need a ruling from me on at this time, Mr. Dranove?

MR. DRANOVE: No.

THE COURT: So before we recess, I just want to make it clear in terms of a plea situation. That the District Attorney has informed counsel for the defendant, and myself, that the DA is not offering any plea down from the top count, which is murder. Therefore, the scope of sentence that is available for a plea is 15 to life to a maximum of 25 to life.

Based on what I know about this case, if the defendant wanted to take a plea now, I would offer him the minimal sentence, which is 15 years to life, and if he doesn't want to take that, and from what I heard I don't expect him to, then he needs to be aware that he faces the risk of a sentence of up to 25 years to life after trial.

So I am sure you have explained that to him, Mr. Dranove?

MR. DRANOVE: I have.

THE COURT: Is there any interest in that plea?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

Sandoval 20

THE COURT: I am just telling you, not because I want you to take a plea, but because it's important that you understand the risk that you take in going to trial.

You face an exposure of a sentence of up to 25 years to life. Noone knows what a jury will do. So you're taking that risk. I just want you to understand that.

Okay, we will recess until tomorrow for jury selection. I will ask counsel to be here at ten o'clock.

We're going to put 20 jurors in the box, and they are numbered 1 through 10 in the front row. Eleven through 20 in the back row.

You'll have fifteen minutes per round for your questioning. After we pick a jury tomorrow, and then the People are to be ready to open and proceed with the People's case on Wednesday.

Have a good day.

* * * * * *

(Adjourned to May 5, 2009)

1	SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
2	COUNTY OF KINGS: CRIMINAL TERM: PT 35
3	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
4	- against - Ind. #1453/05
5	
6	ENRIQUE RIVERA, Murder 2
7	Defendant. Voir Dire
8	320 Jay Street Brooklyn, New York
9	May 5, 2009
1	B E F O R E: HONORABLE ALAN MARRUS, presiding
.2	(Appearances same as previously noted)
14	MICHELE J. WALKER, OFFICIAL SENIOR COURT REPORTER
.6	THE COURT: Before we bring the jurors in,
.7	is there anything you want to put on the
.8	record, Mr. Chu?
.9	MS. CHU: Yes, your Honor, I do have an
20	application for The Court. Actually, I have
21	two things I want to do.
22	Yesterday he spoke to you about the
23	witnesses we would be calling during trial.
24	This time on the retrial. I just wanted to set
25	forth there were there were six people that

1 viewed the line-up in this case. 2 whom -- one of whom did not make an identification. Three of whom did. 3 4 that did are Rudy Cordova and Jahaira Serrano. 5 Third person was a person by the name Julio Rivera. We do not intend to call Rudy Cordova 6 7 and Jahaira Serrano. In light of the fact, based upon the statements given to detective as 8 9 well as statements given, oral sworn 10 statements, given to the District Attorney's 11 office, they were later interviewed at the 12 prior trial. Just while we were in the middle 13 of trial. And based upon their statements, 14 they were, in effect, recanting what they had 15 told us before and they were saying that they 16 didn't see what they said they saw and they 17 were not going to testify the way they had told 18 us things that happened because they say now 19 they couldn't remember. For those reasons, I 20 am not going -- seeking to put on Cordova or 21 Mr. Serrano in light of the fact I did not believe them, and I do not believe the People 22 23 have an obligation -- I actually do not have an 24 obligation, but I cannot put on a witness who I 25 think would be perjuring themselves at trial.

And which I would think they would be doing if they were to tell me something different than what they already told me in a sworn statement.

In addition, that there was a Luis Rivera that testified the last trial. He also gave statements to the detectives, and when they testified at the trial, he did not identify the defendant as touching anybody where he -- as he did give that to his statement to the police.

In addition to that, I had an intern in the courtroom who advised me that after the defendant -- I am sorry -- after the witness, Mr. Rivera, had gotten off the stand, he had winked at the defendant because essentially what he had testified was just that the defendant had gotten punched and that was all he had seen, which is contrary to what he had said to the police at the time that he was interviewed. For that reason, your Honor, again, I would not be seeking to call Mr. Rivera as a witness in this case.

The second issue that I'd like to raise before The Court was that on the -- at the trial, the defendant testified on his own behalf, and during the testimony of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defendant there was several articles of clothing that were referred to by the detectives at his parent's home. They were -they fit the description of what the defendant was wearing at the time of the incident and they were vouchered and sent to the DNA lab for testing. Subsequent to being sent for testing, the hat that was recovered at his mother's house was found to have blood on it that belonged to Mr. Ojeda, the victim in this case. The People seek to introduce a portion of the defendant's prior trial testimony relating to the fact that he admitted on the stand that those items of clothing were what he was wearing that night when he was at the bar on the night in question. We seek to introduce that through the court reporter as direct evidence on our evidence case. two-prong test to be done in order to elicit only a portion of a trial testimony or prior proceedings testimony. And while it is true we're not permitted to introduce only the portion of the statement where it would be misleading, the People's position is that it would not be misleading. That actually

admission of the clothing is separate and apart from what he testified to at the trial, which is that basically he was just there and he didn't do anything. And that would be exculpatory. The other is just self-serving statement.

The second test under the rules is an issue of completeness. And the People's position is that his admission of what he was wearing is independent of his claims that he did not actually stab the victim in this case. The People would direct The Court's attention to two cases. People versus Harris, 249 A.D. 2nd, 775. That is a Third Department case. And People versus Jones, 203, A.D. 2nd, 183.

In People versus Harris, the court held that it was proper for the People to introduce a portion of the grand jury testimony without the remainder because the omitted points -- I am sorry -- the omitted parts were not extricably intertwine nor did they create a false presentation to the jury. The court held that there was no basis to allow the defendant to bolster his trial testimony by introducing earlier self-serving denials of culpabilities.

In People versus Jones, the court in that case held that the introduction of only the inculpatory portion of the grand jury testimony was proper since the People had no obligation to introduce the defendant's exculpatory statements because they were self-serving and not extricably intertwined with the inculpatory statement.

So, in essence, the People are asking that these inculpatory statements made by the defendant at the time of the prior trial relating to the clothing that we will be putting into evidence be allowed to be brought out by the court reporter who is going to be testifying in this case with regard to Detective James O'Sullivan's testimony.

THE COURT: Do you have the portion of the testimony in the transcript for me to review?

MS. CHU: I did not bring that with me, but I can have that for you as soon as I go back to my office or actually call my paralegal and have her bring it over.

THE COURT: We are about to pick jury, I can't review it right now.

Obviously you need to show Mr. Dranove the

actual portion of the transcript that you intend to use.

Mr. Dranove?

MR. DRANOVE: I'd like to know if the prosecution can cite any case authority where trial testimony, not grand jury testimony, is the subject? They've only cited the two cases where grand jury testimony was chosen also with respect to three witnesses. Prosecution may think they're not speaking of truth. But that may be because their truth is the truth and it doesn't fit their theory. I'd like to be able to contact these people. I don't have any phone numbers for them. I don't know how to contact them.

Thirty-six months after -- 35 months after the last trial, I suddenly hear that there was a wink in the courtroom from an unknown trial assistant. I think that is a meaningless statement. I'd like to know how I can contact these people. I think they're, at minimum, able to present evidence that is favorable to the defense and I'd like an opportunity to reach them.

I appreciate the prosecutor honoring her

commitment and letting the court know, although about two weeks ago I wrote to the prosecution and asked her any favorable evidence, and she wrote back saying, I complied with all rights. I can bring that letter in.

I don't know when the prosecutor learned that three witnesses are not favoring the prosecution in this case at this time, and Mr. Rivera -- by the way, Judge, if I remember correctly, was the bouncer on duty that night? And I don't know how to reach these people. The bar is closed. Because there is another homicide in that bar, my client was on Rikers Island at the time. So I don't know how to reach Mr. Rivera. Or the other individuals.

MS. CHU: Well, your Honor --

THE COURT: Wait. I am a little surprised to hear this being raised and discussed in this case at this time.

First of all, one of the witnesses, you just said, testified at the previous trial, and then you said that witness didn't give the testimony that you had expected at the trial.

Isn't that what you said?

MS. CHU: Yes.

THE COURT: So as far as that witness is concerned, there is nothing new to report. You already heard that witness' account at the time. At the trial. You knew years ago what that witness said. That is no surprise. And she now, now in light of this thing with the wink, is totally irrelevant to that issue as far as that witness is concerned. She doesn't intend to call him based on the testimony he gave at the prior trial.

Now, as to the other two witnesses, I believe what she said was that they have recanted their prior testimony, basically, saying they didn't see what they had originally told the police they said they saw. Which probably makes them useless witnesses for anyone. But as far as contact information is concerned.

MS. CHU: Jahaira Serrano and his counsel and that their boyfriend, Mr. Cordova --

THE COURT: If you have any contact information regarding a telephone number or whatever, I would ask you to provide that. To Mr. Dranove. If he wants to speak to these people.

MS. CHU: Just in response to his letter, he was given statements that were made by Mr. Rudy Cordova, Mr. Jahaira Serrano. He was given all relevant statements. Audio-taped statements. DD5. Grand jury testimony of all these witnesses. So had all --

MR. DRANOVE: Except --

MS. CHU: Documents that I have.

MR. DRANOVE: Except the statements where they said, I didn't tell the truth earlier. Those statements are apparently not recorded or preserved in any summation at all. I don't know. I am not trusting Miss Chu to be able to have a hundred percent recall of what these witnesses stated.

THE COURT: She'll give you the contact information. But it's my experience that based on what the recommendation is, these witnesses, having given sworn statements and then having inconsistent statements after that, make them problematic as witnesses for either side to call at this trial. But I should think you should get the contact information so you can speak to them yourself.

MR. DRANOVE: Does that include

Mr. Rivera?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CHU: I'll give whatever contact information I have for Mr. Rivera as well.

MR. DRANOVE: Right away.

MS. CHU: I'll give it to you as soon as I get back to my office.

MR. DRANOVE: Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Now, as far as the other part of her application, regarding the testimony of the defendant at the prior trial. Again, to me this sounds like something that may be somewhat of a moot issue since there was apparently a dispute at the last trial that the defendant acknowledged that he was at the bar the night this happened and didn't dispute the fact that the clothing was his. The only issue is the legal issue as to whether or not you should be allowed to introduce this on your direct case through his transcript. What you need to do is to provide the exact portion of the trial that you propose to introduce. Let Mr. Dranove review it, and then I will hear any objection that he may have as to the completeness or incompleteness of that part of the account that you propose to offer at this trial. Since it's 31

very fact specific to your application when it comes to completeness.

MR. DRANOVE: Your Honor, perhaps you could include that portion of the testimony where my client had been told to take the hat off, and he said he did take it off and he put it back on. He took it off. And there is no doubt from the trial testimony that at least one or more law enforcement officers went to the client's mom's apartment and took the clothing from there. I don't know how many nails they have to put in that coffin, but I'll address it when I have the opportunity then.

THE COURT: Right. I am saying what you need, and I am ordering the DA to supply to you, is their proposed portion of the testimony that they want to introduce on their direct case. And then if you have an objection to that as being incomplete or misleading, I'll hear your objection, then I'll make my ruling. But I can't do that until I see what they propose to introduce.

THE COURT: Is there anything else before we bring the jurors in?

MS. CHU: No.

Jury Selection

33

1	THE COURT: Mr. Dranove?
2	MR. DRANOVE: No, sir.
3	THE COURT: Okay. We will wait the
4	arrival of the jurors.
5	(pause)
6	COURT OFFICER: Your Honor, ready for the
7	panel?
8	THE COURT: Yes, we are.
9	COURT OFFICER: Jury panel entering.
10	COURT CLERK: Will the prospective jurors
11	stand up and raise your right hand, please?
12	(Whereupon, the prospective jury panel was
13	duly sworn at this time.)
14	THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and
15	gentlemen: May name is Judge Alan Marrus, and
16	you are here in Part 35 of the Supreme Court
17	for the trial of a criminal case. I'd like to
18	introduce to the you parties to this trial.
19	Representing the People of the State of
20	New York is Assistant District Attorney Phyllis
21	Chu.
22	Miss Chu.
23	MS. CHU: Good morning. Good morning.
24	THE COURT: The defendant on trial in this
25	case is Mr. Enrique Rivera.

Jury Selection

Mr. Rivera, be good enough to stand up.
THE DEFENDANT: Good morning. Good

morning.

THE COURT: His attorney, representing him at this trial, Mr. Joel Dranove.

MR. DRANOVE: Good morning.

THE COURT: Anyone knows the defendant, Mr. Rivera, his attorney, Mr. Dranove, the district attorney, Miss Chu or myself? Just raise your hand to let me know.

Now, some other people who may be involved with this case, who are not here today, I will read their names. If you think you know anyone, just raise your hand to let me know.

Edgar Ojeda, Matthew Ojeda, Raymond
Classen, Carlos Solomon, Jonathan Dominguez,
Marcus Carrasquillo, Rudy Cardova, Luis Rivera,
Edwin Carpio, Angel Rodriguez, Kimberly
Tapia-Mendez, Enrique Navarette, Gloria Vale,
Patricia Glasglow, Jahaira Serrano, William
Arrufat, Molly Schloemer, Angel Rivera, Julio
Rivera, Anna Cassalas, Jennifer Sipress, Yon
Paul Casalouc, Judith Brusca, Justin Harriman,
Police Officers Zambrano, Chi Shing Bao,
Acosta, Lopicollo, Garda. Detective John

Darino. Hector Rivera and James Gaynor.

Detectives David Cruz and Michael Cunningham,

James O'Sullivan. Detective Deborah Kennedy.

Doctor Frede Frederic. Linda Razzano. And

Tito Rivera. Do any of those names ring a bell

with anyone?

I am going to tell you a little something about this case that we are about to try: The People of the State of New York are alleging that on February 27, 2005, at a bar located at 314 39th Street, in the Sunset Park section of Brooklyn, the defendant committed the crime of murder. Specifically the charges are that on that date, February 27, 2005, at that location, 314 39th Street, a bar called El Borinquen Bar, the defendant stabbed to death a man name Edgar Ojeda.

Now, those are the charges in this case. That is all they are, charges. Under the law, the defendant is presumed innocent of these charges, and it will be the burden of the district attorney to prove his guilt by proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Is there anyone who feels you cannot follow the rules that the defendant is presumed

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

innocent and it is the district attorney who has the burden of proof to prove his guilt by proof beyond a reasonable doubt? Anyone have a problem with those rules? Is there anyone that feels you don't understand English well enough to serve as a juror? Can you all understand me? THE JURORS: Yes. THE COURT: Anyone have a problem with that so far? If you do, just raise your hand to let me know if you don't understand anything. Don't be ashamed to let me know. Is there anyone that feels you have a health problem that would prevent you from serving? Such as you cannot hear or some problem like that. Yes, ma'am? You want to raise your hand? THE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: No reason for you to walk anywhere. Stay there. THE JUROR: My mother was murdered in November, 2008? THE COURT: Go over to the clerk, I can

see you're very upset. Sorry about that.

Jury Selection

As far as the health question is concerned. Does anyone feel you have a health problem, such as you cannot hear, that would prevent you from serving? You're all the healthy like me?

I hope so.

Now, this is a criminal trial. We need jurors who will make a decision. That decision will either be guilty or not guilty. Is there anyone who feel you can't make that decision because of religious or personal beliefs?

Yes, ma'am?

THE JUROR: I might have a problem with that.

THE COURT: You can't do that?

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Go over to the clerk.

John, please mark her card, send her for civil.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am? We'll send you for a civil case. Those are the longer trials.

(Juror Excused)

Let me go over with you the schedule for this trial. If you are selected to serve.

We will work on the trial the rest of this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Today is Tuesday. So you would have to return here the rest of this week, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday for the trial. And, of course, we will not work on the weekend. you have to return next week, and this trial will be completed by the end of next week. We expect to get the case for it's decision probably by Wednesday of next week. have to be able to serve next week. schedule, in terms of time, would be you would never have to be here before ten o'clock in the morning. We don't start before ten. And you would never have to be here pass five o'clock. We never work pass five. And if I can get you out of her earlier, that may work too some days. But that is the schedule for the trial. If you have a problem with that, please let me know by raising your hand.

On this side, yes, ma'am? What is your problem?

THE JUROR: I am diabetic, I have to have my meals in between.

THE COURT: You just bring it here with you. We can use the refrigerator. If you need it, you can have it at any time. That would be

Jury Selection

no problem for us. We can certainly handle that.

2.4

Anyone else over here on this side? Yes, sir?

What about as far as schooling?

THE JUROR: I am excused from school or excused from college.

THE COURT: When you're on jury duty, you're excused from any place. But if you don't want to be here because you want to go to school, then you have to postpone your jury duty to when you're not in school.

I understand the students get a lot of time off during the year, you will have plenty of time to serve on a jury when you're off. If you don't want to be here because of class, I will excuse you, but you wouldn't get credit for your jury service. You'll be postponed to another time.

THE JUROR: I would like to postpone it.

THE COURT: Go over to clerk, you have to come back again.

John, a postponement for college.

(Juror Excused)

Anyone else on this side? Nobody here on

Jury Selection

40

		40
_		
1	this side?	
2	Let's start, second row, yes, ma'am?	
3	THE JUROR: Surgical procedure I have to	
4	go back and have	
5	THE COURT: I am sorry?	
6	THE JUROR: I have to have stitches	
7	removed following surgical procedure. I am	
8	scheduled for that next week.	
9	THE COURT: If you're picked for the jury,	
10	let us know. We will make sure you can get	
11	your stitches removed. That is not going to be	
12	a long-term thing. We will work that out with	
13	you.	
14	Yes, ma'am.?	
15	THE JUROR: I speak English a little but	
16		
17	THE COURT: You understand me?	
18	THE JUROR: A little bit, yes.	
19	THE COURT: Have I said anything that you	
20	don't understand?	
21	THE JUROR: 50/50.	
22	THE COURT: If I tell you, you go over to	
23	the clerk, that is a hundred percent.	
24	(Juror Excused)	
25	If someone is going to tell me they don't	

Jury Selection 1 understand 50 percent, I can't argue with the 2 person. It is what it is. Who else in the next row? Yes, ma'am? 3 THE JUROR: I have a trip scheduled to 4 5 leave the country next week. THE COURT: If you're picked, I get to use 6 your tickets because I need a vacation. 7 Go over to the clerk, give him your name. 8 9 (Juror Excused) 10 THE COURT: Who else? Yes, sir? 11 THE JUROR: I have a scheduling conflict 12 for tomorrow at 2:30. I have a job interview. 13 THE COURT: If you're picked for the case, I'll contact, if necessary, whoever it is you 14 15 have an interview to make sure you get the 16 interview. They can't deny you that because 17 jury duty is an important obligation. You'll get your job interview. You have to let us 18 19 know if you're picked. Make sure you remind me 20 before you leave, if you're selected, about 21 that. Thank you. 22 Who else? THE JUROR: I need postponement for 23

THE COURT: Go over, give your name to the

24

25

school.

clerk.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Jury Selection Isn't it final examine time? THE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: In the back row, yes? THE JUROR: I have to go to school. THE COURT: You need to postpone and go study. Go over to the clerk. How people come in during final examine time for jury duty? I don't know. Anyone else in the row over here? Let's go to the jury box. Yes, ma'am?

42

THE JUROR: Only thing -- only problem I need to have access to my cell phone. You know, in case -- only thing in case a certain number comes up because my mother's in a nursing home. And she's like this right now.

THE COURT: When we are working on the trial, obviously, we don't have cell phones on in the courtroom. We give you a phone number where someone can call the courtroom at any time. If that will work for you. In case of an emergency. We'll give you a number, someone can get through at any time.

THE JUROR: No problem then.

THE COURT: You we will still be able to

	Jury Selection	43
1	have your telephone. But right now you can't	
2	call on your cell phone. I hope it's off.	
3	THE JUROR: Oh, yes, it is.	
4	THE COURT: Someone else? Who else? Yes,	
5	sir.	
6	THE JUROR: I have a flight scheduled next	
7	Wednesday.	
8	THE COURT: We don't want to give go	
9	over to the clerk and give him your name.	
10	(Juror Excused)	
11	THE COURT: Anyone else in the jury box?	
12	Yes, sir?	
13	THE JUROR: Your Honor, I got a work	
14	problem. It'll be a little difficult for me.	
15	THE COURT: Tell us who's going to	
16	THE JUROR: I can't do that, but will be	
17	little rough, not impossible, but they are long	
18	days. Two or three long days.	
19	THE COURT: Again, what I suggest you do,	
20	postpone your jury duty to when	
21	THE JUROR: I can do that.	
22	THE COURT: Go over and give him your	
23	name.	
24	(Jury Excused)	
25	THE COURT: Anyone else in the jury box	

that I missed? Noone else?

All right, we are ready to move to the next process. Here's how we are going to work it. The clerk is going to select your names, randomly picking your cards out of a wheel he has on his desk. If he selects your name, I ask you to take a seat in the jury box.

Once we fill the box with jurors, I am going to ask each of you a few questions about yourselves. And then the attorneys get a brief opportunity to ask you some questions also.

Now, why are we going to ask you questions? We are looking for people who can be fair and impartial. To both sides. So, please, try to answer the questions that you are asked as honestly as you can. If at any time you feel embarrassed about something or you don't want to answer something in front of the whole group, if that is a problem, just let me know. We are not looking to embarrass you. We are looking for certain information to pick a jury.

When your name is called, take your belongings, come up to the jury box, one of our court officers will tell you where to sit.

I am going to ask you to step out of the 1 jury box. You can fill in the seats in the 2 gallery when they become available. 3 COURT CLERK: Dorothy Jean Baptiste. 4 5 J-E-A-N-B-A-P-T-I-S-T-E; Alyson Gill, G-I-L-L; Knita Artis, A-R-T-I-S; Michael Pabon, 6 7 P-A-B-O-N; Staphen Chance, C-H-A-N-C-E; Carl Beard, B-E-A-R-D; Crystal Rodriguez, 8 R-O-D-R-I-G-U-E-Z; Glendon Britton, 9 B-R-I-T-T-O-N; Yuwnus Warner, W-A-R-N-E-R; 10 Benjamin Proffer, P-R-O-F-F-E-R; Denise 11 12 McCarthy, M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y; Mary Jones, J-O-N-E-S; Cara Howe, H-O-W-E; Marlon Antigua, 13 A-N-T-I-G-U-A; Nigel Jeremiah, J-E-R-E-M-I-A-H; 14 15 Victor Sutton, S-U-T-T-O-N; Kerrianne McGowan, M-C-G-O-W-A-N; Lisa Constantine, 16 C-O-N-S-T-A-N-T-I-N-E; Lorraine LaPera, 17 L-A-P-E-R-A; Andrew Steininger, 18 19 S-T-E-I-N-I-N-G-E-R. THE COURT: Those that weren't selected 20 21 for this round, please pay attention because probably you'll get your term very shortly. It 22 will go a lot faster if you follow what we are 23 24 doing. Those over here in the jury box, I am 25

Jury	Selection		

46

going to ask that you tell us one at a time the 1 2 neighborhood in Brooklyn in which you live, 3 your marital status, or if you're in a committed relationship with someone, what kind 4 5 of work, if any, you are doing at the present time. 6 7 We are going to start with you Miss Jean Baptiste. What part of Brooklyn you live in? 8 9 THE JUROR: Canarsie. 10 THE COURT: Your marital status? 11 THE JUROR: Single. 12 THE COURT: Are you working? 13 THE JUROR: Yes. 14 THE COURT: What kind of work do you do? THE JUROR: Sales associate. 15 THE COURT: What kind of business? 16 THE JUROR: Abercrombie & Fitch. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. 18 Next we have Miss Gill, you want to tell 19 20 us about yourself, please? THE JUROR: I live in Boreum Hill I am 21 22 married and I'm an attorney. 23 THE COURT: I am sure the attorneys would like to know what kind of legal work you 24 25 specialize in?

	Jury Selection	47
1	THE JUROR: Criminal.	
2	THE COURT: Do you do criminal defense	
3	work?	
4	THE JUROR: I work for the Attorney	
5	General. Prosecution.	
6	THE COURT: What unit?	
7	THE JUROR: Federal Habeas Corpes section.	
8	THE COURT: Next we have Miss Artis. Tell	
9	us about yourself?	
10	THE JUROR: I live in Flatbush. Brooklyn.	
11	I'm single, and I work in the Department of	
12	Social Services.	
13	THE COURT: What kind of work do you do	
14	there?	
15	THE JUROR: I work on Medicaid.	
16	THE COURT: Thank you.	
17	Mr. Pabon is next.	
18	THE JUROR: Yes, your Honor.	
19	I live in Boreum Hill. I'm single. And	
20	I'm self-employed. I'm a carpenter.	
21	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Pabon.	
22	Next up, Mr. Chance.	
23	THE JUROR: I live in the Midwood section	
24	of Brooklyn. I'm married. And I'm retired.	
25	THE COURT: In what line of work did you	

1	do, Mr. Chance?
2	A I work for New York City Department of
3	Sanitation.
4	THE COURT: Are you enjoying your
5	retirement?
6	THE JUROR: Yes, I am.
7	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
8	Next up, Mr. Beard?
9	THE JUROR: I'm single. I live in Bedford
10	Stuyvesant, and I work for the New York City
11	Police Department.
12	THE COURT: What kind of work do you do
13	there?
14	THE JUROR: Police officer.
15	THE COURT: Where are you assigned?
16	THE JUROR: The Bronx.
17	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
18	Next up we have Miss Rodriguez.
19	THE JUROR: Bushwick, Brooklyn. Single.
20	I'm a student. I am not working right now.
21	THE COURT: What are you studying?
22	THE JUROR: Criminal Justice.
23	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
24	You can make it through this trial?
25	THE JUROR: Sure.

	Jury Selection	49
1	THE COURT: Miss Britton is next.	
2	I live in Crown Heights section. Married.	
3	I'm home attendant.	
4	THE COURT: Thank you very much.	
5	Next up, Mr. Warner.	
6	THE JUROR: I live in Bedford Stuyvesant,	
7	Brooklyn. I'm telephone technician, and I am	
8	single.	
9	THE COURT: Thank, Mr. Warner.	
10	Move on next to Mr. Proffer.	
11	I live in Crown Heights. I am single, and	
12	I'm freelance writer.	
13	THE COURT: What kind of things do you	
14	write about?	
15	THE JUROR: Travel writing. Mostly.	
16	THE COURT: Thank you very much.	
17	Now we move to the back row, Miss	
18	McCarthy.	
19	THE JUROR: Sheepshead Bay. Married. And	
20	semi-retired. I am a substitute teacher.	
21	THE COURT: Thank you, Miss McCarthy.	
22	Next up we have Miss Jones.	
23	THE JUROR: I live in Bay Ridge. I am	
24	single, and I work for the Met Correctional	
25	Center, Manhattan.	

1	THE COURT: Are you a corrections guard
2	there?
3	THE JUROR: I am certainly investigator.
4	THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Jones.
5	Next we have Miss Howe.
6	THE JUROR: I live in Williamsburg. I am
7	single. And I am a freelance photographer.
8	THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Howe.
9	Move over next to Mr. Antigua.
10	THE JUROR: Bushwick. Single. I'm a
11	Principal Administrator Associate for the New
12	York City
13	MR. DRANOVE: I am sorry?
14	THE COURT: Principal Administrator
15	Associate for the New York City Parks
16	Department.
17	Now, move on to Mr. Jeremiah.
18	THE JUROR: I live in East Flatbush.
19	Married. Carpenter for construction.
20	MS. CHU: I didn't hear the last part.
21	THE COURT: Works for construction company
22	as a carpenter.
23	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Jeremiah.
24	Mr. Sutton?
25	THE JUROR: Married. Flatbush Avenue,

51

Jury Selection 1 Brooklyn. Self-employed real estate investor. THE COURT: Next up, Miss McGowan. 2 3 THE JUROR: Hi. I am single. I work customer service for University Music. I live 4 5 in East New York. THE COURT: Move over to Miss Constantine. 6 7 THE JUROR: I live in Flatbush. I am single, and I work in financial industry. 8 9 THE COURT: Next up, Miss Lapera? 10 THE JUROR: I am single. I work in 11 Department of Education. I am oral translator, 12 which is I work with the child with Coeklar 13 implant in a high school. And I have been working with her since third grade. She reads 14 15 my lips, and I take her notes for her. 16 THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Lapera. 17 Next up, Miss Steininger. THE JUROR: I live in Prospects Heights. 18 19 Single. Work for the borough president. 20 THE COURT: What kind of work do you do for the --21 22 THE JUROR: I work on his capital budget. 23 THE COURT: Can we get some more money for

THE JUROR: I'll call him up and ask him.

24

25

the court system?

1	THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr.
2	Steininger.
3	I have a few more questions each. To save
4	time, I am going to ask you all at once. If
5	the answer is yes, just let me know.
6	First, I'd like to know if you ever been
7	on a jury in a criminal or federal trial or if
8	you were on a grand jury? If you were actually
9	own a jury, just let me know.
10	I see five hands for follow-up.
11	Mr. Pabon, about how long ago were you on
12	a jury?
13	THE JUROR: Approximately eight years ago,
14	I believe, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Was it a criminal or civil
16	trial?
17	THE JUROR: It was a criminal trial.
18	THE COURT: Did the jury reach a verdict?
19	THE JUROR: Yes, we did.
20	THE COURT: You remember the crime that
21	was involved?
22	THE JUROR: Yes, I do.
23	THE COURT: Was it murder, drugs, robbery,
24	assault?
25	THE JUROR: It was murder.

		33
1	THE COURT: Thank you.	
2	Mr. Chance, about how long ago for you?	
3	THE JUROR: Approximately eight years ago,	
4	little longer.	
5	THE COURT: You remember what kind of case	
6	it was?	
7	THE JUROR: I think it was a civil.	
8	THE COURT: Civil case?	
9	THE JUROR: Yeah.	
10	THE COURT: Did the lawyer settle before	
11	you reached a verdict or	
12	THE JUROR: They settled.	
13	THE COURT: I think I got everyone in the	
14	front row. I'll move back to Mrs. McCarthy.	
15	THE JUROR: I think it was five years ago.	
16	Five, six years ago.	
17	THE COURT: What kind of	
18	THE JUROR: Criminal, and it was assault.	
19	THE COURT: Did the jury reach a verdict?	
20	THE JUROR: Yes.	
21	THE COURT: Thank you.	
22	Miss Constantine?	
23	THE JUROR: It was civil, over six years	
24	ago. And they settled.	
25	THE COURT: Miss Lapera?	
	i de la companya de	

54

THE JUROR: It was civil, and I don't 1 remember how long ago it was. 2 3 THE COURT: Did they reach a verdict or did they --4 5 THE JUROR: No, we reached a verdict. THE COURT: Anyone else that I missed? 6 7 Next question. I have already heard that there is one 8 9 member of our group working for the police 10 department. Anyone ever -- who we haven't 11 heard -- who ever worked for the police department, the DA's office, the court system 12 13 or someone in your immediate family who ever 14 worked for those agencies? Miss Gill? 15 THE JUROR: I work for the Brooklyn DA. 16 The Queens DA, and my husband work for the 17 18 Brooklyn Queens DA. THE COURT: Anyone else. 19 THE COURT: Miss Pabon? 20 THE JUROR: My father served 26 years with 21 the NYPD, and he was retired approximately ten 22 years ago. And he died of cancer last year. 23 THE COURT: Thank you. Sorry about that. 24

Anyone else ever worked for law

enforcement agency or someone in your family?

My brother is a detective in Jacksonville,
Florida.

THE COURT: Anyone else?

Because this is a criminal case, the police are involved. The police are involved in every criminal trial. We will hear witnesses from the police department, and when they testify, we treat them the same way we treat all of the other witnesses. Police officers are just like anyone else when it comes to be witnesses. They can tell the truth. They can be mistaken. They can lie. Anyone that has a problem being completely fair and impartial when it comes to police witnesses?

Mr. Beard, I guess I have to ask how do you feel about sitting as a juror and having to judge police officer testimony. Do you think you can be completely fair about that?

THE JUROR: Yeah.

THE COURT: Or you'll have an issue? No problem?

THE JUROR: No problem.

THE COURT: How about you, Miss Gill?

	Jury Selection	56
1	THE JUROR: No problem.	
2	THE COURT: Next question. Anyone who's	
3	been a victim of a crime or someone in your	
4	immediate family who may have been the victim	
5	of a crime?	
6	Miss Britton?	
7	THE JUROR: My husband was accused of	
8	assault on my son.	
9	THE COURT: About how long was that?	
10	THE JUROR: The case finished, it was	
11	dismissed March of this year.	
12	THE COURT: Here in Brooklyn?	
13	THE JUROR: Yes.	
14	THE COURT: Did you come down to court on	
15	the case?	
16	THE JUROR: No, it was just resolved.	
17	THE COURT: Anything about the experience	
18	of your husband and your son that is going to	
19	create a problem to be a fair juror?	
20	THE JUROR: Yes because he was arrested	
21	unfairly.	
22	THE COURT: You can return to the central	
23	jury room, Miss Britton. Go downstairs.	
24	(Juror Excused)	
25	THE COURT: Who else has been the victim	

	Jury Selection	57
1	of a crime or someone in your family?	
2	Mr. Proffer? Someone tried to rob you?	
3	THE JUROR: Ah-huh.	
4	THE COURT: Your house or you personally?	
5	THE JUROR: Me personally.	
6	THE COURT: Was anyone ever caught?	
7	THE JUROR: No.	
8	THE COURT: Does that experience create a	
9	problem for you to be a fair juror?	
10	THE JUROR: (Indicating)	
11	THE COURT: Anyone else in the front row?	
12	Back row, Miss Constantine.	
13	THE JUROR: Robbery. Apartment. It was	
14	over five years ago.	
15	THE COURT: Here in Brooklyn?	
16	THE JUROR: Yes.	
17	THE COURT: Did you report it?	
18	THE JUROR: Yes.	
19	THE COURT: Anyone ever caught?	
20	THE JUROR: No.	
21	THE COURT: Miss McGowan.	
22	THE JUROR: Yes, my aunt was murdered.	
23	THE COURT: Here in Brooklyn?	
24	THE JUROR: No.	

THE COURT: Where?

1	A This is another state.
2	THE COURT: About how long ago?
3	THE JUROR: Over ten years ago.
4	THE COURT: Police ever caught anyone in
5	this case?
6	THE JUROR: Not that I know.
7	THE COURT: Regarding your aunt, would
8	that create a problem for you to be a fair
9	juror?
10	THE JUROR: I will be all right.
11	THE COURT: Anyone else? Victim of a
12	crime? Noone else?
13	Substitute this seat?
14	COURT CLERK: Alan Chu. C-H-U.
15	THE COURT: Take the empty seat there, Mr.
16	Chu.
17	You want tell us about yourself, please?
18	THE JUROR: I forgot three questions.
19	THE COURT: You weren't paying attention
20	out there?
21	THE JUROR: It was long time ago.
22	THE COURT: I need to know what part of
23	Brooklyn you live, marital status or
24	relationship, what kind of work you do?
25	THE JUROR: Live in downtown Brooklyn. I

1	am married. And I work as CPA.
2	THE COURT: I am paying attention, you
3	have a job interview tomorrow?
4	See, I remember what you said. I am doing
5	better than you.
6	Have you ever been on a jury before?
7	THE JUROR: No.
8	THE COURT: Do you have any relationship
9	to anyone that works for the police department,
10	the DA's office or the court system?
11	THE JUROR: No.
12	THE COURT: Can you be fair when it comes
13	to police witnesses?
14	THE JUROR: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Any experience being a victim
16	of a crime in your family?
17	THE JUROR: Yes.
18	THE COURT: Who was that?
19	THE JUROR: It was me. It was a burglary,
20	my apartment, over ten years ago.
21	THE COURT: Did you report it?
22	THE JUROR: Yes, I did.
23	THE COURT: Anyone ever caught?
24	THE JUROR: No.
25	THE COURT: I am finished with my

questions for you.

One more question for anyone else. Anyone had the experience that the other -- one of the other jurors mentioned about being arrested for something or convicted of something in your family. An experience we also need to know.

Someone on this jury ever been arrested or convicted of anything? Please raise your hand to let me know.

Start in the front row. Miss Rodriguez?

A My brother and my uncle. My brother was arrested and convicted with three felonies for armed robbery. And my uncle served 15 years state prison I don't know what it was for.

THE COURT: Was it here in Brooklyn, relatives or someplace else?

THE JUROR: Yeah, in Brooklyn.

THE COURT: Did you ever go to court on any of their cases?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Did you ever hear anything about their cases that would create a problem for you to be a fair juror?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Thank you for letting us know.

1	Yes, ma'am.
2	THE JUROR: My brother, he was he did
3	time. I am not sure what for, at the time I
4	was young. It happened in Brooklyn. He served
5	time upstate.
6	THE COURT: Nothing you heard about that
7	would create a problem for you to be a juror?
8	THE JUROR: Uh-uh.
9	THE COURT: Anyone else?
10	Miss Lapera?
11	THE JUROR: My nephew was in jail in
12	Riverhead. For robbing someone's house.
13	THE COURT: Did you ever go to court on
14	his case.
15	THE JUROR: No, I never went to the court,
16	but I felt as he should have been in rehab
17	instead
18	THE COURT: Anything what you heard about
19	that case create a problem for you to be a fair
20	juror?
21	THE JUROR: No.
22	THE COURT: Anyone else?
23	All right, I am finished with my
24	questions, and I am now going to give the
25	attorneys a chance to talk to you. We start

with the DA.

Miss Chu, would you like this board?

MS. CHU: No.

THE COURT: Would you like the table

opened up?

MS. CHU: I can do it.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen:

My name is Phyllis Chu, and I will be the assistant district attorney that handles this case should you be selected as jurors.

Now, the first thing I want to talk to you about is what the judge was saying as far as really what we are looking for honest answers. There are no wrong answers when we ask these questions because really now is the only time that we get to exchange with you and ask you for your opinions or your feelings on certain issues that may come up during the course of this trial. So don't anybody think, oh, she wants us to say certain things. No attorney wants you to say something that's not the truth. Whatever the feelings are, that is what we want to hear, okay, and also we are not trying to pry.

Judge says if you have feelings that make

you uncomfortable at all, anything, just let us know. We will be able to discuss that in private.

First thing I want to talk to you about is the fact that there's a lot of things on TV now a days. There are a bunch of shows about the criminal justice system, about police officers, about a lot of Law and Orders, CSI. I am guilty, like everybody else, of watching all those things because there are almost on every channel.

You all understand that this is not TV.

This is not something where the witnesses are going to come up here, and they are going to testify from a script. There is no commercials here. It's not going to be wrapped up in an hour. Can you all appreciate this live testimony, these people are going to be coming up here and telling you that on a particular day they were at a particular place and they saw something? They are going to tell you about it. That is considered to be evidence.

Can you all except that?

THE JUROR: Yes.

MS. CHU: The spoken word is considered to

be evidence just like if we give you something in your hand to hold, like physical evidence, or photos. Can you all appreciate that?

THE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CHU: Now what I want to talk to you about next. Do you think if more than one person views any occurrence at the time, they're going to have the same account of what happened?

THE JUROR: No.

MS. CHU: Why do you think that is?

THE JUROR: Because everybody sees things different certain cases. Every person don't think alike.

MS. CHU: Do you also think when someone tells somebody what they saw, what they experienced, that they are going to express themselves the same way that the person next to them is going to express themselves?

THE JUROR: No.

MS. CHU: You all are individuals. When you guys were answering questions the judge just posed to you, you all answered in your own little way. Would you all agree with that?

25 THE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CHU: Do you think that would affect
how people describe something?

THE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CHU: Just because people -- there is

MS. CHU: Just because people -- there is possible some people seen one thing and maybe see something else but not necessarily going to see exactly the same thing. Can you all appreciate that that might happen?

THE JUROR: Yes.

MS. CHU: Now along the lines of that. Do you also think that if someone tells somebody what happened that they are going to say it the same way every time?

THE JUROR: Not at all.

MS. CHU: Have you ever told an occasion what happened to you, later you think, I forgot to tell them about this part, right?

And vice versa, you tell them something at the beginning, and when you say it again, you might forget what you mentioned before. Would you all agree that might happen? Do you think that necessarily means you are not telling the truth?

THE JUROR: No.

MS. CHU: Do you think you're the kind of

person to distinguish what is important and what is not important? Big inconsistency versus little inconsistency. Can you do that in this case?

THE JUROR: Yes.

The next thing I want to talk to you about is how many people think they know what circumstantial evidence is? Big word. You see things on TV.

I wanted to give you an example. You're wearing a white shirt. Right? You don't know me. I come up to you, and I tap you. And as soon as I do that, you see there is a red marker across your shirt.

MR. DRANOVE: Your Honor, I object to that.

THE COURT: So far it's okay.

MR. DRANOVE: Can we approach?

THE COURT: No reason to approach. Let me hear the question.

What is the question?

MS. CHU: So my question to you. If you didn't see what was in my hand, would you be able to conclude that I had a marker in my hand because I just made a streak on your shirt?

67

1 THE JUROR: Yes. 2 MS. CHU: Even though you didn't see the 3 marker. 4 You may hear evidence in this case that 5 witnesses did not see a weapon, but there will be other evidence to show that there was a 6 7 weapon used. Anyone here have a problem with the fact that these witnesses cannot have seen 8 9 the weapon? Anybody here have a problem with 10 that? No? 11 Can you think of a reason why someone might not see a weapon, like a knife or a sharp 12 13 object or something like that? 14 MR. DRANOVE: I object to this. 15 THE COURT: I will sustain the objection. 16 That gets too fact specific to our case. 17 Let's move on. 18 MS. CHU: Are you -- does anyone here 19 disagree that if someone didn't see an actual weapon that you would have a problem, you 20 21 wouldn't be able to --22 MR. DRANOVE: Objection. 23 THE COURT: Again, it's too fact specific.

MS. CHU: In this case, there are

I will sustain the objection.

24

allegations that a knife was used in this case. 1 2 There was never a knife recovered or a weapon recovered in this case. Anyone here that 3 feels -- I'm sorry, I am going to withdraw 4 5 that. Will be other evidence to show that there 6 7 was a weapon, such as a knife, used, but you won't actually get to see that knife. Is there 8 9 anyone here that thinks I need to see that kind of evidence before I can decide a case like 10 this? 11 12 MR. DRANOVE: I object to this. THE COURT: That's a hard question for 13 14 jurors to answer. 15 MS. CHU: I ask do you have the problem that a knife wasn't recovered in this case? 16 MR. DRANOVE: I object again. 17 THE COURT: They don't know enough about 18 19 the case to know it's a problem. 20 MS. CHU: Your Honor, may we approach? 21 THE COURT: No, there no reason to 22 approach. 23 MS. CHU: If you heard that there wasn't a

knife recovered, would you have a problem deciding this case without a --

24

MR. DRANOVE: I repeat any objection.

THE COURT: I sustain the objection.

MS. CHU: All right, I will move on to something else.

You may hear from witnesses in this case that have criminal histories. All right. Now, is there anyone here that feels that if someone has a criminal history that they couldn't -- I am being extreme here -- that they couldn't believe what they have to say? That they wouldn't even listen to what they had to say to see whether or not he makes sense, what is the other evidence that you're going to hear in this case? Would anyone have anybody have a problem listen -- at least listening to them?

THE JURORS: No.

MS. CHU: You cannot listen to anybody that is going to testify that has a criminal history?

THE JUROR: No.

MS. CHU: You can't have a open mind? Give them a fair listen?

Do you agree, convicted of a crime or not or whether there was police officers, that you have to make your own determination as to

whether or not they're telling the truth?
Would you agree with that? And would you be
able to do that in this case?

THE JURORS: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CHU: Now, along the lines of that. There will be police officers that testify in this case. And we have a number of people here, we heard the gentleman that left, he said he does something with law enforcement. Lot of different types of jobs we have. We have a police officer, we have a substitute teacher. You know, can you all appreciate that it's not fair to judge the whole by just one? So I may have substitute teacher that was all -- I may have a substitute teacher that was terrific, but I can't say all substitute teachers are terrific or awful. Just based upon one experience. Can you all do that in this case and give each of the witnesses, whether they're police officers or not, whether they have criminal history or not, a fair listen to just see if what they say makes sense and connect it with other evidence in this case? Can you all do that?

THE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CHU: Now, next thing I want to talk to you about is the fact that you may hear evidence in this case that the defendant made certain statements. Is there anyone here that feels that it's possible that a person who is being questioned by the police officer would make statements would even talk to the police? Do you think that is possible?

THE JURORS: Yes, it's possible.

MS. CHU: Do you think someone being

spoken to by the police that it's possible that they might say something that would be in the best interest for them?

MR. DRANOVE: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled. I'll allow it.

THE JUROR: Yes.

MS. CHU: Put them in the best light?

THE JUROR. Yes.

MS. CHU: I'm not saying that is what happened. I am just saying, do you think it's possible?

THE JURORS: Yes, it is possible.

MS. CHU: Now, are you the type of people that if you're chosen as jurors in this case that can distinguish between what might be

truthful, what might not be truthful and compare and contrast the other evidence that you're going to get?

THE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CHU: Anyone here that says, you know what, I am not so good at that? Would it be fair to say that you all make judgments everyday about whether or not someone is telling you the truth?

THE JUROR. Yes.

MS. CHU: You have people that you work with. Anybody work with someone you don't really like them so much. They tell you a story, and when they tell you what happened, and this is goes for whether someone's making a statement, goes for witnesses as well. But what they are telling you, whether you like them or not, if what they're saying makes sense or doesn't make sense. You make that judgment everyday. Yes?

THE JUROR: Yes.

MS. CHU: You can do that in this case, yes?

THE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CHU: Now, there is a burden of proof,

and I have that burden of proof. Can everybody here promise me that you're going to hold me to the burden of proof that the judge tells you I have to prove. All the things that I have to prove, you're going to hold me to that? Yes?

THE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CHU: On the flip side, there are certain things that I don't have to prove. Like I don't have to prove motive.

MR. DRANOVE: I am going to object this area.

THE COURT: Overruled. I'll allow it. Ask the question.

MS. CHU: Does anyone here -- I am sorry.

Does everyone here promise me that you all also will not hold me to a higher burden to what the judge is going to tell you my burden is? You will not?

Also there's something I want to talk to you about is the judge is going to give you instructions as to the fact that sympathy for the victim, for the defendant has no place in your deliberations in this case.

Is there anyone here that thinks, by looking at the defendant, that there is

something about him or anything about the way
he looks that would prevent you from deciding
this case solely on the evidence? Because now
is really the time that you have to tell us.
Because obviously if you're selected as jurors,
it will be too late.

Anybody here feel that, you know, based upon your experiences, what you hear in the criminal justice system, you might have something else to affect your abilities to be fair in this case? Everybody okay?

Anything that I talked about that anybody thinks, you know, I mentioned earlier that you think you might want to know now? Any questions for me?

Thank you very much for your time.

THE COURT: Mr. Dranove.

MR. DRANOVE: Thanks, Judge.

Can I have that table?

THE COURT: I will ask one of the court officers to open it up for you.

MR. DRANOVE: Well, my name is Joel Dranove. I represent Mr. Rivera.

Miss Gill, we have had a case or two together; is that right?

	Jury Selection	75
1	THE JUROR: I don't recall.	
2	MR. DRANOVE: I have been in the Brooklyn	
3	DA's office?	
4	THE JUROR: Yes. '92 to '96.	
5	MR. DRANOVE: Do you remember me?	
6	THE JUROR: No, I don't.	
7	MR. DRANOVE: Attorney with the federal	
8	federal lab is the	
9	MS. CHU: I am going to object. She said	
10	she didn't	
11	MR. DRANOVE: constitution	
12	THE COURT: I'll allow it.	
13	MR. DRANOVE: Constitutional law.	
14	THE JUROR: Yes.	
15	MR. DRANOVE: When were you in the Queens	
16	DA's office?	
17	THE JUROR: From '97 to 2001.	
18	MR. DRANOVE: Remember me from Queens DA's	
19	office?	
20	THE JUROR: No.	
21	MR. DRANOVE: Never seen me before?	
22	THE JUROR: No. Can't say never seen you,	
23	I just don't recall you.	
24	MR. DRANOVE: Do you think that your many	
25	years in the prosecutor's office may have	

1	caused you to have predisposition to believe
2	they're prosecuting the right guy for the right
3	crime?
4	THE JUROR: No. Because there's a lot of
5	people, lots of innocent people, charged with
6	crimes and convicted of crimes.
7	MR. DRANOVE: Thank you.
8	Mr. Pabon, do you believe that is possible
9	innocent people are convicted of crimes?
10	THE JUROR: Yes, I do.
11	MR. DRANOVE: How would you know if
12	innocent persons being prosecuted?
13	THE JUROR: You don't know.
14	MR. DRANOVE: You wait to hear the
15	evidence?
16	THE JUROR: Exactly.
17	MR. DRANOVE: Officer Beard, have you
18	always been an officer in the Bronx?
19	THE JUROR: No.
20	MR. DRANOVE: In Brooklyn at any time?
21	THE JUROR: No.
22	MR. DRANOVE: Where else?
23	THE JUROR: Harlem. Harlem and the Bronx.
24	MR. DRANOVE: Just investigated any
25	homicide cases at all or participated in the

		/ /
1	investigation?	
2	THE JUROR: I did one probably about ten,	
3	15 years ago.	
4	MR. DRANOVE: What do you know on the job?	
5	THE JUROR: I work in Transit now.	
6	MR. DRANOVE: Underground or above?	
7	THE JUROR: Both.	
8	MR. DRANOVE: Are you undercover or	
9	something I shouldn't be asking?	
10	THE JUROR: Uniform.	
11	MR. DRANOVE: Have you testified in court?	
12	THE JUROR: Yeah.	
13	MR. DRANOVE: Questioned by defense	
14	lawyers?	
15	THE JUROR: Not recently. No.	
16	MR. DRANOVE: Anything about the trial	
17	experience that leave us with any propensity	
18	towards one side or the other?	
19	THE JUROR: No.	
20	MR. DRANOVE: Miss Jones?	
21	THE JUROR: Yes.	
22	MR. DRANOVE: Work in MCC?	
23	THE JUROR: Yes.	
24	MR. DRANOVE: You're in special	
25	investigations?	
	1	

	70
1	TUD TUDOD Was
1	THE JUROR: Yes.
2	MR. DRANOVE: What do you investigate?
3	THE JUROR: Staff and innocent crimes
4	within inside the institution.
5	MR. DRANOVE: You say innocent crimes,
6	whatever it might be?
7	THE JUROR: Yes.
8	MR. DRANOVE: What about staff, what do
9	you investigate about staff?
10	THE JUROR: We have staff, good staff, we
11	have bad staff.
12	MR. DRANOVE: Have you have you we
13	come across each other
14	THE JUROR: I don't recall you.
15	MR. DRANOVE: How long have you been
16	working as a special investigator, whatever
17	your title is?
18	THE JUROR: Here MCC, New York, I have
19	been here since 2007.
20	MR. DRANOVE: Before 2007, where were you?
21	THE JUROR: I was in
22	MR. DRANOVE: Federal
23	THE JUROR: Yes.
24	MR. DRANOVE: Bureau of Prisons?
25	THE JUROR: Yes.

79 1 MR. DRANOVE: What were you doing out 2 there? 3 THE JUROR: Same thing. MR. DRANOVE: How many years --4 THE JUROR: From 2003 until I got here. 5 6 MR. DRANOVE: Do you have any problem with 7 keeping an open mind? 8 THE JUROR: No. 9 MR. DRANOVE: You weren't never a juror; 10 is that correct? 11 THE JUROR: No. 12 MR. DRANOVE: Is it correct that you were 13 never a juror? 14 THE JUROR: Yes. 15 MR. DRANOVE: I am going to tell all of you that I am not going to give you any, what 16 17 if you heard questions. I prefer you hear it 18 and make up your own mind at the end. 19 Now, is there anybody who hasn't heard 20 whatever we discussed, has any problem with the nature of what they have heard may or may not 21 come out on the witness stand? 22 And that being a problem that prevents 23 24 them from saying, I want to be a juror on this

25

case?

80

Jury Selection No hands means, I don't have a problem, 1 2 right? Okay. It's 20 people takes two sheets. 3 Okay, Mr. Sutton, did you say you're a real estate investor? 4 5 THE JUROR: I did. MR. DRANOVE: You work out of Brooklyn? 6 7 THE JUROR: I work out of Manhattan. MR. DRANOVE: Have you ever been a juror? 8 9 THE JUROR: No. 10 MR. DRANOVE: You ever been called down to 11 be a juror before this time? 12 THE JUROR: Yes. 13 MR. DRANOVE: Were you ever in an panel? 14 THE JUROR: No, I never got --15 MR. DRANOVE: Never got this far? THE JUROR: No. 16 17 MR. DRANOVE: What type of real estates do 18 you deal with? THE JUROR: Commercial. 19 MR. DRANOVE: Like I said before. And the 20 prosecutor said, trial is about to start, and 21 I'm finished, Judge. 22 23

THE COURT: All right, so here's how it works. The parties will decide who they would like to select from this group. And once we

24

81

Jury Selection finish with that, then we go forward with the 1 next round. 2 3 I am going to excuse everybody, go outside, stretch your legs before the next 4 5 rounds begin. Those in the gallery, step out in the 6 7 hallway. Those in the jury box, follow the way out. 8 9 Don't leave the floor. If you want to use the facility, they're 10 down the hall. We will be a few minutes. 11 12 (Jury Panel Excused) 13 THE COURT: A juror asked to speak with me 14 privately. Counsel want to approach? 15 For the record, is it okay? It's all 16 right? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes. 18 THE COURT: Come on up. 19 (Whereupon, there was a discussion held 20 off the record with a juror at this time.) 21 THE COURT: For the record, the juror 22 seated in seat 16, Mr. Sutton, just came up and

told us that he can't be fair. He said he's

biased, and when I asked him why, he couldn't

give me a reason. But he just wanted us to

23

24

know. And counsel did not have questions for him.

MR. DRANOVE: Also, with respect to that, my client was advised by me of his right to be present at these sidebars, which right was explained in People versus Antemarche I related to my client. He informed me to notify The Court, I am putting more expansively on the record because I did notify The Court that he agrees that I should be the only one from the defense table at the sidebars with the jury men and women.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Miss Chu, let me know when you're ready.

(pause)

THE COURT: Let's talk about the first 12 jurors. Everyone in the front row. And the first two jurors in the back row. That's up to and includes Miss Jones in seat 12.

Any challenge for cause by the People?

MS. CHU: None for cause.

THE COURT: Any challenge for cause, by the Defense, in first group of 12?

MR. DRANOVE: No.

THE COURT: Precinct by the people.

1	MS. CHU: Yes. Juror number 1.
2	THE COURT: Miss Jean Baptist is excused.
3	MS. CHU: Juror number 2.
4	THE COURT: Miss Gill is excused.
5	MS. CHU: Juror number 3.
6	THE COURT: Miss Artis is excused.
7	MS. CHU: And juror number 7.
8	THE COURT: Miss Rodriguez is excused.
9	MS. CHU: I have completed my challenges.
10	THE COURT: I will hear any peremptory
11	challenges by the defense, remaining jurors in
12	that group?
13	MR. DRANOVE: 4.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Pabon is excused.
15	MR. DRANOVE: 6, Officer Beard.
16	THE COURT: Mr. Beard is excused.
17	MR. DRANOVE: 11 and 12.
18	THE COURT: Miss McCarthy and Miss Jones
19	are excused.
20	THE COURT: Does that complete your
21	peremptory challenge in that group?
22	MR. DRANOVE: Ah-huh.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Chance, juror number 1.
24	Mr. Chu, juror number 2.
25	MR. DRANOVE: Does the prosecutor know

whether or not she's related to Mr. Chu?

THE COURT: I asked the audience whether

they knew anyone here. It's a very common name, as you know.

MR. DRANOVE: I had to raise the question. I think it's a fair question.

THE COURT: You want to answer the question?

MS. CHU: I don't know.

THE COURT: It's sort of like Smith. It's a common name.

I asked people out there if there's any relationship or know any of the people. I guess like Rodriguez. He didn't -- would be a common Hispanic name or whatever. There is no reason to believe he has any connection with her because I asked him that. He would know if he did. He didn't raise his hand.

Number 3 is Miss -- Mr. Warner. I am sorry. And number 4 is Mr. Proffer.

Let's talk about the eight jurors. That everyone left in the jury box.

Now, I believe we are going to excuse Mr. Sutton in seat 16 for cause on consent. Correct?

	Jury Selection	85
1	MS. CHU: Yes.	
2	MR. DRANOVE: Yes.	
3	THE COURT: He is excused on consent for	
4	cause.	
5	Any other challenges for cause in that	
6	group by the People?	
7	MS. CHU: No.	
8	THE COURT: For cause by the Defense?	
9	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
10	THE COURT: Peremptory by the People?	
11	MS. CHU: Yes. Juror number 17.	
12	THE COURT: Miss McGowan.	
13	MS. CHU: Juror number 18.	
14	THE COURT: Miss Constantine.	
15	MS. CHU: And juror number 19.	
16	THE COURT: Miss Lapera.	
17	MS. CHU: And I have no further	
18	challenges.	
19	THE COURT: Any peremptory challenge by	
20	the Defense two remaining jurors in that group?	
21	MR. DRANOVE: None.	
22	THE COURT: That means Miss Howe becomes	
23	juror number 5. Mr. Antigua, number 6.	
24	Mr. Jeremiah number 7. And number	
25	Steininger, number 8.	
	i	

THE COURT: Mr. Chu is the one who had the 1 job interview. So I am asking your permission 2 3 for me to speak to him outside of your presence, if necessary, to resolve that issue. 4 5 I'll only speak to him about his job interview to get the information and possibly have to 6 7 speak to his employer before he leaves today. Is there any objection by the People to 8 9 that? 10 MS. CHU: No. 11 THE COURT: By the Defense? MR. DRANOVE: None. 12 (Whereupon, the selected jurors were sworn 13 at this time.) 14 (Remaining jury panel entering) 15 THE COURT: We're ready to go forward with 16 17 the next round. When your name is called, 18 bring your belongings and take a seat in the 19 jury box. COURT CLERK: B-I-N-E-M. 20 N-A-I-M-A-N; Gem Vancooten, V-A-N-C-O-O-T-E-N; David Garcia, G-A-R-C-I-A; Thomas McDonald, 21 22 M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D; Joseph O'Connell, O-C-O-N-N-E-L-L; Calvin Chandler, 23 24 C-H-A-N-D-L-E-R; Nicola Telford, T-E-L-F-O-R-D; Catherine P-A-S-Z-K-O-W-S-K-I; Edwin Gonzalez, 25

	Jury Selection	87
1	G-O-N-Z-A-L-E-Z; Yevgeny Spektor,	
2	S-P-E-K-T-O-R; Eutisha Rennix, R-E-N-N-I-X;	
3	Reginald Mathis, M-A-T-H-I-S; Marjorie Trafton,	
4	T-R-A-F-T-O-N; Lucy Koteen, C-O-T-E-E-N;	
5	Marianne Thompson, T-H-O-M-P-S-O-N; Christie	
6	Rasado, R-A-S-A-D-O; LaToya Everett,	
7	E-V-E-R-E-T-T; Anthony Arnold; A-R-N-O-L-D;	
8	Jean Loconde, L-O-C-O-N-D-E; Marianne Tollier,	
9	T-O-L-L-I-E-R.	
10	THE COURT: You folks heard my questions	
11	before. I am going to ask you the same things	
12	that I asked the first group.	
13	Let's start with you. Naiman. Tell us	
14	about yourself, please?	
15	THE JUROR: I live Boro Park. Brooklyn.	
16	I am married, and I run a restaurant.	
17	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Naiman.	
18	Next we have Vancooten.	
19	THE JUROR: I live in Flatbush. I'm	
20	retired. I'm a registered nurse. I work in	
21	the unite advertised unit.	
22	THE COURT: What part of Brooklyn you live	
23	in?	
24	THE JUROR: Flatbush.	
25	THE COURT: Next we have Mr. Garcia.	

1	THE JUROR: I am a student. I live in
2	Park Slope. And I am engaged.
3	THE COURT: What are you studying to be?
4	THE JUROR: A cartoonist.
5	THE COURT: You're able to get through the
6	trial with your scheduling as a student no
7	problem?
8	THE JUROR: Next Friday I have final. I
9	don't know
10	THE COURT: If we need you to be prepared
11	to be here next week?
12	THE JUROR: Possible way I can talk to
13	my professor and schedule the test on office
14	hours.
15	Is there a way I can prove I was here?
16	THE COURT: I give everyone proof they
17	were here.
18	Thank you very much.
19	Mr. McDonald?
20	THE JUROR: Live in Bay Ridge. Married,
21	and I'm retired guidance counselor.
22	THE COURT: Thank you.
23	Mr. O'Connell.
24	THE JUROR: I live in Sunset Park. I am
25	single, a copy editor for a magazine.

	03
1	Freelance writer.
2	THE COURT: What magazines, you cover what
3	subject?
4	THE JUROR: Forbes. Financial magazine.
5	THE COURT: Thank very much.
6	Mr. Chandler?
7	THE JUROR: I live in Crown Heights.
8	Unemployed and single.
9	THE COURT: Have you work in the past?
10	THE JUROR: Yes.
11	THE COURT: What kind
12	Media coordinator.
13	THE COURT: Thank you.
14	Next we have Miss Telford.
15	THE JUROR: I live in Mill Basin. I am
16	registered CN. Nursing assistant, and I am
17	married.
18	THE COURT: Thank you.
19	Next up is Miss Paszkowski.
20	THE JUROR: I live in Park Slope. I am in
21	a relationship, and I'm an attorney.
22	THE COURT: Again, what kind of legal work
23	do you do?
24	I am court attorney for a Civil Court
25	judge. In New York county.

	90
1	THE COURT: Did you ever do any criminal
2	work before you did that?
3	I interned one semester in the New York
4	County District Attorney's office.
5	THE COURT: Move over to Mr. Gonzalez.
6	THE JUROR: I live in Canarsie. I am
7	single. And I do building maintenance.
8	THE COURT: Thank you.
9	Next up is Mr. Spektor.
10	THE JUROR: I live in Bensonhurst. I am a
11	designer. I'm married.
12	THE COURT: Thank you.
13	Let's go to the back row. Miss Rennix.
14	THE JUROR: I live in East Flatbush. I am
15	in a relationship, and I'm a cashier.
16	THE COURT: What kind of business?
17	THE JUROR: Cafe.
18	THE COURT: We move over to Mr. Mathis.
19	THE JUROR: I live in Flatbush. I am
20	married. And I am computer tech.
21	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Mathis.
22	Next, Miss Trafton.
23	THE JUROR: I am single. Live in Crown
24	Heights, and I do event marketing.
25	THE COURT: Event marketing.

	Jury Selection	91
1	THE JUROR: For a furniture magazine.	
2	THE COURT: Forbes?	
3	THE JUROR: No.	
4	THE COURT: Next, Miss Koteen?	
5	THE JUROR: I am married. I live in Fort	
6	Greene. I have been a teacher. I currently	
7	work in	
8	THE COURT: What subject do you teach?	
9	THE JUROR: I worked with younger children	
10	and then afterschool. After school program.	
11	Director for after school program two years.	
12	THE COURT: What do you do now?	
13	THE JUROR: I work in lactation breast	
14	feeding help.	
15	THE COURT: Miss Thompson.	
16	THE JUROR: I live in Williamsburg. I am	
17	single, and I am a student.	
18	THE COURT: What are you studying to be?	
19	THE JUROR: A psychiatrist.	
20	THE COURT: Your studies permit you to be	
21	here now?	
22	THE JUROR: Yeah. I am taking sometime	
23	off right now.	
24	THE COURT: Thank you, Thompson.	
25	Next we have Miss Rasado.	

	Jury Selection	92
1	THE JUROR: I live in Bay Ridge. I am in	
2	a relationship. I am freelance graphic	
3	designer.	
4	THE COURT: We move next to Miss Everett.	
5	THE JUROR: I live in Flatbush. And edit	
6	magazine. What was the other question?	
7	THE COURT: Are you married or in	
8	THE JUROR: In a relationship.	
9	THE COURT: Thank you.	
10	Next up is Mr. Arnold.	
11	THE JUROR: In relationship and	
12	Williamsburg, Brooklyn. I'm real estate	
13	developer.	
14	THE COURT: What kind of developer?	
15	THE JUROR: Real estate.	
16	THE COURT: Thank you.	
17	Next up is Mr. Loconde.	
18	THE JUROR: East Flatbush. I am engaged.	
19	And I do marketing promotion.	
20	THE COURT: Thank you.	
21	Next is Miss Koteen.	
22	THE JUROR: I am single. I live in	
23	Flatbush, and I am retired.	
24	THE COURT: What kind of work do you do?	
25	THE JUROR: Clerical.	

1	THE COURT: What kind of business?
2	THE JUROR: Social services.
3	THE COURT: Thank you.
4	Is there anyone in this group who has been
5	selected to be on a jury before? Any kind of
6	case, just raise your hand if you've actually
7	been on a jury.
8	Let me just start over here. Mr.
9	Gonzalez, how long for you?
10	THE JUROR: Nine years ago.
11	THE COURT: What kind of case was it?
12	THE JUROR: It was murder.
13	THE COURT: Did the jury reach a verdict?
14	THE JUROR: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Miss Paszkowski?
16	THE JUROR: It was 12 years ago. It was a
17	prosecution sting case. And we did reach a
18	verdict.
19	THE COURT: Who else in the front row, I
20	see hands? Mr. McDonald?
21	THE JUROR: About 20 years ago. It was a
22	civil case.
23	THE COURT: Was there a verdict or did
24	they settle it?
25	THE JUROR: It turned into a mess because

Jury Selection we went to trial and the first witness for the plaintiff screwed up his story and the lawyers was trying to get him to change his story and THE COURT: The trial ended? THE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Hopefully that is not going to happen here. Who else in the front row? Mrs. Koteen? THE JUROR: Yes, an accident case. THE COURT: Did the jury reach a verdict?

94

THE COURT: In the back row, let me see those hands again.

Mr. Mathis?

THE JUROR: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

then --

THE JUROR: It was a civil case. It did go to a verdict.

THE COURT: Anyone else in the back row? Anyone else, I haven't heard from, ever work for the DA's office, police department, court system, someone in your immediate family who had worked for those agencies?

Mr. Mathis?

THE JUROR: I have two brothers. One retired police. One is now working for the

	Jury Selection	95
1	police.	
2	THE COURT: Do you know where your brother	
3	is assigned right now?	
4	THE JUROR: Downtown Brooklyn.	
5	THE COURT: Anything about your	
6	relationship with them that creates a problem	
7	for you to be a fair juror?	
8	THE JUROR: I think I can.	
9	THE COURT: You can fair?	
10	THE JUROR: I can be fair.	
11	THE COURT: Mr. McDonald, is your hand up?	
12	THE JUROR: Yes.	
13	My father was a New York City detective.	
14	He's deceased.	
15	THE COURT: Anyone else?	
16	Miss Paszkowski?	
17	THE JUROR: I just forgot to say something	
18	about myself.	
19	My job is in civil, but we were in	
20	criminal assigned for a year. New York City.	
21	THE COURT: Who was the judge you work	
22	for?	
23	THE JUROR: Barbara Jaffe.	
24	THE COURT: Anyone else?	
25	Anyone have a problem as far as being fair	

1	when it comes to police testimony?
2	We are going to have police officer
3	witnesses. Anybody couldn't treat them the
4	same way as anyone else? No better, no worse.
5	Anyone has a problem with that?
6	Anyone had the experience of being the
7	victim of a crime or someone in your family?
8	Mr. O'Connell?
9	THE JUROR: I was a victim of armed
10	robbery, a store hold up about a year and a
11	half ago.
12	THE COURT: Was that here in Brooklyn?
13	THE JUROR: Yes, it was in Bushwick.
14	THE COURT: Did you report it?
15	THE JUROR: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Was anyone ever caught?
17	THE JUROR: No, not to my knowledge.
18	THE COURT: Is that going to create a
19	problem to be a fair juror?
20	THE JUROR: I don't think so.
21	THE COURT: Anyone else in the front row?
22	Miss Paszkowski?
23	My grandparents were murdered 27 years
24	ago.
25	THE COURT: In Brooklyn?

	Jury	Selection	97
1	THE JUROR: No	, Poland.	
2	THE COURT: An	yone caught?	
3	THE JUROR: Ye	s.	
4	THE COURT: Do	es that impact your ability	
5	to be a fair juror	in a murder case?	
6	THE JUROR: No	, not at all.	
7	THE COURT: Mr	. Gonzalez?	
8	THE JUROR: I	was robbed last August at	
9	gunpoint.		
10	THE COURT: He	re in Brooklyn?	
11	THE JUROR: Ye	es.	
12	THE COURT: Di	d you report it?	
13	THE JUROR: Ye	es.	
14	THE COURT: An	yone ever caught?	
15	THE JUROR: Ye	es.	
16	THE COURT: Di	d you have to testify or	
17	have you		
18	THE JUROR: No	. I had to come over to	
19	testify in front of	the grand jury.	
20	THE COURT: Th	at is what I meant.	
21	What happened	with the case? Is it	
22	finished?		
23	THE JUROR: Th	e detective never called me	
24	back. They just ca	alled to testify in the grand	
25	jury what happened	to me.	
	1		

	Jury Selection	98
1	THE COURT: You don't know what happened	
2	with the case.	
3	THE JUROR: I don't know what happened to	
4	the case.	
5	THE COURT: Anything about that experience	
6	that would create a problem for you to be a	
7	fair juror?	
8	THE JUROR: No. Not at all.	
9	THE COURT: Who else in the front row?	
10	Mr. Garcia?	
11	THE JUROR: I was stabbed. About eight	
12	years ago.	
13	THE COURT: Here in Brooklyn?	
14	THE JUROR: (Indicating)	
15	THE COURT: Did you report it?	
16	THE JUROR: (Indicating)	
17	THE COURT: Do you know who did it?	
18	THE JUROR: No.	
19	THE COURT: Did the police ever catch	
20	anyone?	
21	THE JUROR: No.	
22	THE COURT: Now, this case involved a	
23	stabbing that ultimately led to a death.	
24	Do you think, because of your experience	
25	as a victim of a stabbing, that would create a	

1	problem for you to be completely fair and
2	impartial?
3	THE JUROR: Yes, I do.
4	THE COURT: Then return to Central Jury,
5	Mr. Garcia, on the second floor.
6	Anyone else who has been a victim of a
	_
7	crime that I missed?
8	Mr. Loconde?
9	THE JUROR: I was robbed at gunpoint ten
10	years ago. In Brooklyn.
11	THE COURT: He was rob at gunpoint about
12	ten years ago in Brooklyn.
13	Did you report it to the police.
14	THE JUROR: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Anyone ever caught?
16	THE JUROR: No.
17	THE COURT: Anything about that experience
18	create a problem for you to be fair?
19	THE JUROR: No.
20	THE COURT: Mr. Spektor?
21	THE JUROR: That was long ago, about 19
22	years ago, I was assaulted with a knife. My
23	bike got taken away. But I never reported it
24	because it was it wasn't local gang.
25	THE COURT: Anyone else?

	Jury Selection	100
1	Let's fill in seat 3.	
2	COURT CLERK: Jean Bruce B-R-U-C-E.	
3	THE COURT: Mr. Bruce, how are you?	
4	THE JUROR: Fine.	
5	THE COURT: Would you be good enough to	
6	tell us about yourself, please?	
7	THE JUROR: I am married. I live in East	
8	Flatbush. I work in a hospital for special	
9	surgery as a PCA.	
10	THE COURT: What exactly do you do there?	
11	THE JUROR: Like a nurse technician.	
12	THE COURT: Have you ever been on a jury?	
13	THE JUROR: Yes.	
14	THE COURT: About how long ago?	
15	THE JUROR: Eight years.	
16	THE COURT: Do you know what kind of case	
17	it was?	
18	THE JUROR: Civil.	
19	THE COURT: Did the jury reach a verdict?	
20	THE JUROR: Yes.	
21	THE COURT: Anyone in your family ever	
22	worked for those agencies I keep mentioning?	
23	Police, DA's office, court system?	
24	THE JUROR: Yes. My son-in-law.	
25	THE COURT: Who does he work for?	
	I	

	Jury Selection	101
1	THE JUROR: Federal government.	
2	THE COURT: Is there anything about his	
3	work or anything else that would create a	
4	problem to be fair when it comes to police	
5	testimony?	
6	THE JUROR: No.	
7	THE COURT: Anyone been the victim of a	
8	crime in your family?	
9	THE JUROR: I did. I was stabbed eight	
10	years ago.	
11	THE COURT: Here in Brooklyn?	
12	THE JUROR: Yes.	
13	THE COURT: Did I report it to the police?	
14	THE JUROR: Yes.	
15	THE COURT: Did they ever catch anyone?	
16	THE JUROR: Yes.	
17	THE COURT: Was it someone you knew or a	
18	stranger?	
19	THE JUROR: Stranger.	
20	THE COURT: Did you have to testify?	
21	THE JUROR: Yes.	
22	THE COURT: Was there a trial?	
23	THE JUROR: Yes.	
24	THE COURT: Anything about your experience	
25	that would create a problem for you to be a	

1	fair juror in this kind of case?	
2	THE JUROR: No.	
3	THE COURT: Were you seriously injured in	
4	that matter?	
5	THE JUROR: Yes. I was out of work for	
6	six weeks.	
7	THE COURT: You heard the charge in this	
8	case. I just want to make sure, because they	
9	involve a stabbing in this case too, if you	
10	would feel sensitive about the fact that you	
11	were the victim of a stabbing that would impact	
12	your ability to be fair?	
13	THE JUROR: No.	
14	THE COURT: Thank you very much.	
15	Last question for everyone: Has anyone	
16	been arrested, convicted of a crime? Someone	
17	in your family may have had that experience, we	
18	need to know that also.	
19	Mr. Loconde?	
20	THE JUROR: Refusal to take a	
21	breathilizer.	
22	THE COURT: This was driving while	
23	intoxicated or impairment?	
24	THE JUROR: Allegedly, yeah.	
25	THE COURT: Were you arrested for that?	

		103
1	THE JUROR: I didn't take the	
2	breathalizer.	
3	THE COURT: That was here in Brooklyn?	
4	THE JUROR: Yes.	
5	THE COURT: What ultimately happened with	
6	the case?	
7	THE JUROR: It's still open.	
8	THE COURT: Is there something about that	
9	experience with the police obviously you're	
10	not happy about it. We understand that.	
11	THE JUROR: Right.	
12	THE COURT: spill over where you think	
13	it will impact your ability to be a fair juror?	
14	THE JUROR: No.	
15	THE COURT: Who else? Mr. Arnold?	
16	THE JUROR: Trespassing.	
17	THE COURT: Here in Brooklyn?	
18	THE JUROR: No.	
19	THE COURT: Where was that?	
20	THE JUROR: In Connecticut.	
21	THE COURT: What ultimately happened with	
22	that?	
23	THE JUROR: It was dismissed. It was	
24	skateboarding in a drained pool.	
25	THE COURT: Skateboarding in a drained	

	Jury Selection	104
1	pool?	
2	THE JUROR: Yes.	
3	THE COURT: In someone's back	
4	THE JUROR: In someone's backyard.	
5	THE COURT: Anything about your experience	
6	that would create a problem to be a fair juror?	
7	THE JUROR: No.	
8	THE COURT: You still skateboard?	
9	THE JUROR: Of course.	
10	THE COURT: Who else had that experience	
11	of being arrested, convicted or your family?	
12	Mr. Naiman?	
13	THE JUROR: Somebody in my family arrested	
14	for robbery or something like that. Money.	
15	THE COURT: Anything about that create a	
16	problem for you?	
17	THE JUROR: No.	
18	THE COURT: Anyone else?	
19	All right, I am finished with my	
20	questions. And I am going to turn the floor	
21	over to Miss Chu.	
22	MS. CHU: Good afternoon, ladies and	
23	gentlemen.	
24	We talked about the fact that there is a	
25	lot of things on TV now about this whole	

scenario. Courtrooms shows, police shows, things like that. Is there anyone here that feels as though you expect people to come up here and look like actors that you see on the TV, this case is going to get wrapped up in an hour, commercials? You understand that's not real? Can you all accept that people that testify or who come are witnesses in this case are just real live people just like you and I? Yes?

THE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CHU: What I wanted to ask you about is that the fact when the clerk was calling your name out, how many got a little nervous? When you came up here. The judge asked you questions. A little nervous.

Only two people. Yes, a little bit.

Do you think that that might happen, someone might get up here and testify as a witness? Yes?

Would you all agree that everybody shows their nervousness or stress, they deal with stress differently? Would you all agree with that? Can you all take that into consideration when you're deciding or you're listening to

what someone has to say? Yes, you can do that?

Now, we talked a little bit earlier about the fact that if more than one person view something occurring, that not everybody is going to have the same account of what occurred. Anyone here that would disagree with that? That thinks everybody should have the same account?

Noone disagrees? No?

I also talked about the fact that if someone told somebody what happened, every time they said it, won't -- it won't be something that would be unusual. Would you all agree with that as well? Can you accept that people are human just like you and I? Yes?

THE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CHU: Now, we also talked about the fact that if you were wearing a white shirt and I came up to you --

MR. DRANOVE: Objection.

THE COURT: Let me hear the question again?

MS. CHU: And I touched you, and you had a red mark on your shirt, that even though you might have seen a marker in my hand, I clearly

1	must have had one.
2	THE COURT: I'll allow it.
3	MS. CHU: Would you agree with that? Yes?
4	Would you be able to come to that conclusion?
5	Yes? Anyone here that would not be able to do
6	that?
7	MR. DRANOVE: I object to.
8	THE JUROR: If it was unless it was marked
9	before. Obviously
10	MS. CHU: Right. Let's say a clean white
11	shirt you just bought and put it on that day.
12	THE JUROR: Maybe I haven't noticed the
13	mark. Clean white shirt with a mark.
14	MS. CHU: True. If you hear is it
15	possible
16	MR. DRANOVE: I withdraw my objection.
17	THE JUROR: It's possible.
18	MS. CHU: I looked at your shirt, you
19	know, it's got nothing on it. Right? Would
20	everybody be able to draw that conclusion?
21	Yes?
22	Now, we also talked about the fact that
23	you may hear from witnesses in this case that
24	have criminal histories. Is anyone here I
25	am not saying you can take into consideration

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

if someone's been accused or convicted of a crime, you can take that into consideration when you're deciding whether or not to believe them. But I just want to know whether or not, you know what, no matter what, whatever they say, I can believe them. Because of the fact that they've been convicted of a crime or maybe they even have a lifestyle that you don't approve of or you don't care for. Anyone here that thinks right off the bat, I could not give that person a listen? Everybody okay with that? Can you decide on your own whether or not that person, what they tell you, makes sense when you compare, contrast to the other evidence you're going to hear in the case? Can you do that in this case? Yes?

THE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CHU: I talked also about police officer witnesses and the fact that you'll be hearing from some. How many of you ever gotten a ticket from a police officer? Running a red light? Whatever it is. We have all had bad experiences, good experiences and we talked about the fact that everybody, no matter what you do, there are some people that are very

good at what they do and some people are very bad. You have to decide whether these witnesses, whoever they are, whether civilian or they are police officers, if they are telling you the truth based upon the other evidence that you're going to hear in this case. Can you do that?

MR. DRANOVE: Objection to that characterization.

THE COURT: I'll allow it.

You will have to decide whether you believe they are telling the truth or not. That is up to you.

MS. CHU: Can you do that in this case? Yes?

Now, we also talked about the fact that you may be hearing evidence or you might hear evidence in this case the defendant made certain statements. Now, we talked about the fact that -- let me ask you. Do you think it would be unusual for someone who is questioned by the police to ever talk to them?

Does anybody think that is something you can fathom? You're okay with that?

Do you think if someone speaks to the

police they would try to say something in the best light to them? Is there a possibility?

MR. DRANOVE: I object, again, to this area.

THE COURT: I'll allow it.

MS. CHU: Do you think that's a possibility?

Yes.

2.2

Now, are you the type of person that can decide whether or not someone is being truthful or not truthful based upon other evidence you may hear in this case?

Some people think they are not good at that. Do you think you are? Yes? Okay.

Now, the last thing I want to talk about is the fact that we talked a little bit about sympathy.

I want you guys to all take a look at the defendant. Is there anything about the way he looks that you think would prevent you from deciding this case only on the facts? Only on what you hear in here, the evidence that's before you?

Because you understand that once you're selected as jurors and you're back there

deliberating, you can't say, you know what, I feel sorry for someone. Whatever it is.

Sympathy should play no part in your decision in this case.

Can you all separate that and be able to decide this case only on the evidence? Can you do that?

THE JURORS: Yes.

MS. CHU: Anything that we mentioned, either on the other round or during my talk with you or with the judge's, that you think you might want to draw your attention or you have a question? Everybody okay?

Thank you very much for your time.

THE COURT: Mr. Dranove, last but not least.

MR. DRANOVE: This is a test. Raise your hand if you think my client's guilty? Anybody think he's guilty? Raise your hand, this is your chance.

I see no hands up. That is good. You have been paying attention to the judge.

I have a few questions. Too many -Mr. O'Connell, you were a victim of a violent
crime here in Brooklyn. How long ago was it?

112

Jury Selection 1 THE JUROR: It was September of 2007. 2 MR. DRANOVE: Were there -- was it day or 3 night? 4 THE JUROR: Night. 5 MR. DRANOVE: Were you alone at the time? 6 THE JUROR: I was -- there was in a -- I 7 was in a bodega, there was a cashier, I was the 8 only customer in the store. MR. DRANOVE: You still get nervous about 9 10 it when you think about it? 11 THE JUROR: Sometimes. 12 MR. DRANOVE: I say sort of -- well, if 13 you're here, you're going to be sitting through 14 days of testimony concerning a homicide early 15 Sunday morning in a bar. 16 Now, just thinking a little more, do you 17 feel your personal emotions may get in the way of sitting through this? 18 THE JUROR: No, I think I could be fair. 19 20 MR. DRANOVE: Then Mr. Gonzalez, as far as you know, your case is still -- the case where 21 22 you're the victim is still open; is that right?

THE JUROR: I really don't know.

MR. DRANOVE: Don't you care?

THE JUROR: Yes, I care.

23

24

1 MR. DRANOVE: You want to make sure the 2 right guy is convicted? THE JUROR: Yeah. 3 MR. DRANOVE: If it's right --4 5 THE JUROR: If it's the right guy. MR. DRANOVE: Just identify --6 7 THE JUROR: Yes, I went to a line-up. MR. DRANOVE: And since then, have you 8 9 taken any steps, like a phone call, to like 10 step up to make -- and say what's happening? THE JUROR: Well, I spoke to the detective 11 12 and detective said, you know, to come in 13 because I was so traumatized, you know. I came in, and I testified in front of a grand jury. 14 15 And, you know, the attorney told me, you know, 16 you did what you had to do. And that was it. 17 Because I was very traumatized. I was like I 18 wasn't myself. MR. DRANOVE: I just want to ask you 19 20 something personal, but I think it's the right

MR. DRANOVE: I just want to ask you something personal, but I think it's the right question. Since this happened to you in Brooklyn.

THE JUROR: Yes.

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DRANOVE: You've got to rely on if you think you identified the right person.

Brooklyn prosecutor's office want to see that justice is done. Can you give all of us your word, or can you not give us your word that you could put your own personal nightmare aside and just sit there really close to the witnesses, and to Mr. Rivera, this judge, this case, as this case should be judged?

THE JUROR: Yes. Yes.

MR. DRANOVE: Great.

Now, the prosecutor talked to you about putting something on someone's white shirt. In that area, listen to the testimony, direct examination, cross-examination, there are no white shirts, there were no red markers in this case. And there are bad and good guys, but I am not going to attempt an analogy.

Raise your hand, please, if you believe it possible that the police can put pressure on somebody so that the person can make a statement? Do you think police can pressure someone into making a statement? Raise your hand.

Mr. Naiman, you don't know the police can pressure anybody into making a statement?

THE JUROR: I am not sure of the question.

Jury Selection

1	I don't understand. I don't understand how you
2	pressure.
3	MR. DRANOVE: Well, if you don't
4	understand the question, I'll move on.
5	With respect to your relative, was your
6	relative, or someone you know
7	THE JUROR: Relative.
8	MR. DRANOVE: State or federal?
9	THE JUROR: I have no idea.
10	MR. DRANOVE: Is he in jail now?
11	THE JUROR: Yes.
12	MR. DRANOVE: Was he convicted?
13	THE JUROR: Yes.
14	MR. DRANOVE: How many years ago? Were
15	you a witness?
16	THE JUROR: No.
17	MR. DRANOVE: Now, Mr. Bruce, you were
18	stabbed?
19	THE JUROR: Yeah.
20	MR. DRANOVE: Can you put that out of your
21	mine and sit through the testimony in another
22	case where a knife a knife was used?
23	THE JUROR: Yes.
24	MR. DRANOVE: Can you tell us how you can
25	put it out of your mind and judge neutrally

Jury Selection

1	this case?
2	THE JUROR: It's a long time, and I have
3	to move on. I cannot always look back.
4	MR. DRANOVE: Miss Vancooten, did you work
5	in any hospital?
6	THE JUROR: Yes.
7	MR. DRANOVE: In Brooklyn?
8	THE JUROR: Yes. Maimonides Medical
9	Center.
10	MR. DRANOVE: Did can you ever work in the
11	emergency room?
12	THE JUROR: No, I work in neonatal ICU.
13	MR. DRANOVE: That's serious.
14	Well how do you pronounce, Paszkowski.
15	What types of criminal cases were before the
16	judge when you sat in the criminal term?
17	THE JUROR: Just misdemeanors.
18	MR. DRANOVE: Any trials.
19	THE JUROR: I think we did while I was
20	with her, maybe three trials.
21	MR. DRANOVE: You heard all the legal
22	charges and instructions to the jury?
23	THE JUROR: Yes.
24	MR. DRANOVE: I think the judge will tell
25	you the law here, you have to accept that.

Jury Selection	117
THE JUROR: Yes.	
MR. DRANOVE: Now, did you ever learn why	
your grandparents were murdered?	
THE JUROR: You mean do you mean the	
motive?	
MR. DRANOVE: Yes.	
THE JUROR: I think so.	
MR. DRANOVE: What did you understand	
happened?	
THE JUROR: My grandfather was a political	
figure, and it was some kind of politically	
motivate. The robbery that went bad.	
MR. DRANOVE: Sorry to have to raise that	
with you.	
THE JUROR: No.	
MR. DRANOVE: Mr. Loconde, how long ago	
were you a victim of a robbery?	
THE JUROR: Over ten years.	
MR. DRANOVE: Still on your mind as you	
sit here in this courtroom thinking about it	
again, bothered by it?	
THE JUROR: No.	
MR. DRANOVE: Mr. Arnold, what type of	
real estate developer are you?	
THE JUROR: Residential or commerical.	
	THE JUROR: Yes. MR. DRANOVE: Now, did you ever learn why your grandparents were murdered? THE JUROR: You mean do you mean the motive? MR. DRANOVE: Yes. THE JUROR: I think so. MR. DRANOVE: What did you understand happened? THE JUROR: My grandfather was a political figure, and it was some kind of politically motivate. The robbery that went bad. MR. DRANOVE: Sorry to have to raise that with you. THE JUROR: No. MR. DRANOVE: Mr. Loconde, how long ago were you a victim of a robbery? THE JUROR: Over ten years. MR. DRANOVE: Still on your mind as you sit here in this courtroom thinking about it again, bothered by it? THE JUROR: No. MR. DRANOVE: Mr. Arnold, what type of real estate developer are you?

	Jury Selection	118
1	MR. DRANOVE: Brooklyn?	
2	THE JUROR: Brooklyn, Bronx.	
3	MR. DRANOVE: How's it going?	
4	THE JUROR: We have had better days.	
5	MR. DRANOVE: Who hasn't.	
6	Mr. Mathis, two brothers in law	
7	enforcement?	
8	THE JUROR: Right.	
9	MR. DRANOVE: You always get along 24	
10	hours a day, everyday, live with your brothers,	
11	never have any arguments?	
12	THE JUROR: Of course, I have arguments	
13	with them.	
14	MR. DRANOVE: Thank you very much.	
15	I have no further questions.	
16	THE COURT: Okay. Now, there is a group	
17	of you that have not been in the jury box, very	
18	patiently sitting here, listening to everyone,	
19	I am going to excuse you folks for your lunch	
20	right now.	
21	You can go out to lunch. I am going to	
22	ask you to return to the Central Jury room,	
23	second floor, at 2:15. Thank you for your	
24	patience. Have a nice lunch.	
25	Those selected to be on the trial, I am	

going to ask you folks to wait out in the hallway for just a few more moments. Step outside, just wait for us.

And those already in the jury box, we will let you know before you go to lunch if you've been picked. Wait out in the hall for a few more moments. Thank you very much for your patience.

(Prospective Jurors Excused)
(pause)

MR. DRANOVE: With respect to juror 1, may very well have a case -- may have a case -- I am talking about the gentleman, number 9, who said he was robbed at gunpoint, testified in the grand jury in Brooklyn. He doesn't know if the case is over or not.

I think that perhaps we should find out, if we can, if there is a data base the prosecutor can quickly find out if there is a case pending where he's the complaining witness and if prosecutor is prosecuting someone, for example, in this courthouse.

I think -- I don't remember the case law, but there's been some case law about this.

THE COURT: Let's go to this juror when we

Jury Selection

go through the jury selection then.

I don't think we are going to get much information unless we have a name of a defendant to check it out.

MR. DRANOVE: I don't know, data base is sophisticated in the DA's office in Brooklyn. I don't know.

THE COURT: The important thing is information he had, and what he told us. What he told is the most important thing that we have to rely on.

We have eight jurors picked, so we are going to talk about the first four jurors in the box. Everyone up to and including Mr. McDonald in seat 4.

Any challenge for cause by the People?

MS. CHU: No.

THE COURT: For cause by the Defense?

MR. DRANOVE: No.

THE COURT: Peremptory by the People?

MS. CHU: No.

THE COURT: Peremptory by the Defense?

MR. DRANOVE: Yes. Seats 1, 3 and 4.

THE COURT: Mr. Naiman, Miss Bruce and

Mr. McDonald. Are all excused.

Jury Selection

1	That means Miss Vancooten becomes juror
2	number 9.
3	Go to the next three jurors, Mr.
4	O'Connell. Up to and including Miss Telford in
5	seat 7. Any challenge for cause by the People?
6	MS. CHU: No.
7	THE COURT: For cause by the Defense?
8	MR. DRANOVE: None.
9	THE COURT: Peremptory by the People?
10	MS. CHU: Yes. Juror number 6.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Chandler is excused.
12	MS. CHU: That's it.
13	THE COURT: We have two jurors left in
14	this group. Number 5, Mr. O'Connell and juror
15	number 7, Miss Telford. Only two in play.
16	MR. DRANOVE: Number 5.
17	THE COURT: You're challenging
18	Mr. O'Connell?
19	MR. DRANOVE: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Excused.
21	Mrs. Telford is acceptable?
22	MR. DRANOVE: Yes.
23	THE COURT: She becomes juror number 10.
24	Go to the next two jurors in the box.
25	Paszkowski and Gonzalez, for cause by the

Jury Selection People? 1 2 MS. CHU: No. 3 THE COURT: Cause by the Defense? Any for cause by the Defense? For cause. 4 5 MR. DRANOVE: No, sir. THE COURT: Peremptory by the People? 6 7 MS. CHU: No. THE COURT: Peremptory by the Defense? 8 MR. DRANOVE: Judge, could we address 9 10 Mr. Gonzalez? I think that unless he can tell 11 us, or the prosecution can tell us, whether the case is resolved, I would ask that he be 12 13 challenged for cause? 14 THE COURT: Procedurally we just went to 15 you for challenge for cause. I think you can just ask for peremptory. Maybe there was a mix 16 17 up in communication. I am sorry if there was a 18 mix up in communication. MR. DRANOVE: It's probably my fault, I 19 apologize. I don't understand how it is when 20 21 we may very well be a prepped by someone in Miss Chu's office. 2.2 23 THE COURT: Again, procedurally we are at the point where it's a bit of a problem. Why 24

don't you exercise a peremptory challenge? You

	Jury Selection	123
1	have 20 peremptory challenges. I really don't	
2	think you're even going to come close to using	
3	them all. If you have any objection, that is	
4	simply	
5	MR. DRANOVE: I will challenge him.	
6	THE COURT: I don't want to jeopardize	
7	MR. DRANOVE: 19 or 20. May I reassess	
8	it?	
9	THE COURT: Yes.	
10	I think the best way, at this point, to	
11	expedite it, because she did already exercise	
12	no peremptory for him.	
13	He is excused.	
14	What about Paszkowski, is she acceptable?	
15	MR. DRANOVE: Yes.	
16	THE COURT: She becomes juror number 11.	
17	Let's go to the next juror in the box.	
18	Mr. Spektor.	
19	Challenge for cause by the People?	
20	MS. CHU: No.	
21	THE COURT: Challenge for cause by the	
22	Defense?	
23	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
24	THE COURT: Peremptory by People.	
25	MS. CHU: No.	
	1	

	Jury Selection	124
1	THE COURT: Peremptory by Defense?	
2	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
3	THE COURT: Mr. Spektor is number 12.	
4	Let's go to alternate jurors for the first	
5	seat, Miss Rennix.	
6	Challenge cause by the People?	
7	MS. CHU: No.	
8	THE COURT: Cause by the Defense?	
9	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
10	THE COURT: Peremptory by the People?	
11	MS. CHU: Yes.	
12	THE COURT: Miss Rennix is excused.	
13	Mr. Mathis, challenge for cause by the	
14	People?	
15	MS. CHU: No.	
16	THE COURT: Cause by the Defense?	
17	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
18	THE COURT: Peremptory by the People?	
19	MS. CHU: No.	
20	THE COURT: Peremptory by the Defense?	
21	MR. DRANOVE: Yes.	
22	THE COURT: Mr. Mathis is excused.	
23	THE COURT: Two per seat. You have each	
24	used one.	
25	THE COURT: Miss Trafton, challenge for	

	Jury Selection	125
1	cause by the people?	
2	MS. CHU: No.	
3	THE COURT: Cause by the Defense?	
4	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
5	THE COURT: Peremptory by the People?	
6	MS. CHU: No.	
7	THE COURT: Peremptory by the Defense?	
8	MR. DRANOVE: Yes.	
9	THE COURT: Miss Trafton is excused.	
10	That completes your peremptory for that	
11	seat.	
12	Miss Koteen, challenge for cause by the	
13	People?	
14	MS. CHU: No.	
15	THE COURT: Cause by the Defense?	
16	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
17	THE COURT: Peremptory by the People?	
18	MS. CHU: No.	
19	THE COURT: Miss Koteen becomes alternate	
20	number 1.	
21	We are looking for alternate number 2.	
22	Challenge for cause as to Miss Thompson by	
23	the People?	
24	MS. CHU: No.	
25	THE COURT: By the Defense, for cause.	

	Jury Selection	126
1	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
2	THE COURT: Peremptory by the People?	
3	MS. CHU: Yes.	
4	THE COURT: Miss Thompson is excused.	
5	Miss Rasado, challenge for cause by the	
6	People?	
7	MS. CHU: No.	
8	THE COURT: Cause by the Defense?	
9	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
10	THE COURT: Peremptory by the People?	
11	MS. CHU: No.	
12	THE COURT: Peremptory by the Defense?	
13	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
14	THE COURT: Miss Rasado becomes alternate	
15	number 2.	
16	Since we have several jurors, let's go for	
17	a third alternate.	
18	Miss Everett, in seat 17, challenge for	
19	cause by the People?	
20	MS. CHU: No.	
21	THE COURT: Cause by the Defense?	
22	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
23	THE COURT: Peremptory by the People?	
24	MS. CHU: Yes.	
25	THE COURT: Miss Everett is excused.	

	Jury Selection	127
1	Mr. Arnold, challenge for cause by the	
2	People?	
3	MS. CHU: No.	
4	THE COURT: Cause by the Defense?	
5	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
6	THE COURT: Peremptory by the People?	
7	MS. CHU: No.	
8	THE COURT: Peremptory by the Defense?	
9	MR. DRANOVE: Third alternate seat, Judge?	
10	THE COURT: Yes.	
11	MR. DRANOVE: No.	
12	THE COURT: He will be our third	
13	alternate.	
14	We have our jurors. We will swear them	
15	in. And then recess until tomorrow morning.	
16	(Jurors entering)	
17	(Whereupon, the remaining selected jurors	
18	were duly sworn at this time.)	
19	THE COURT: I want to thank each and every	
20	one of you for being so patient and answering	
21	everyone's questions. I hope you didn't find	
22	the process too bad. It could be a lot worse,	
23	let me assure you.	
24	Now, you have any objection, I am going to	
25	let you folks have the rest of the day off. If	

that's okay with you. Is that all right? You have only been here a minute and already you have agreed on something. Isn't that amazing.

Here's the plan. We are going to resume the trial tomorrow morning. We are going to start tomorrow at 10:30 in the morning. I'd like to start on time. Very promptly. So please make a special effort to be here ready to go. It can take a while to get into the building. We have a line of people in the morning, and the elevator can get crowded. So think in terms of getting here by ten o'clock so that you can all be here ready to start at 10:30 in the morning.

You report to a room that is on this floor. The court officer is going to show you where that room is, and that will be your room for your use for the rest of the trial.

It's a very nice room. You're going to have a beautiful view of Manhattan so you can enjoy it.

Now, if you should run into any of the parties to this trialfrom now on, if you see them out of the courtroom, they may be in lobby getting into an elevator, you might see them in

the hallway coming into the building, they're not allowed to speak to you. I'm sure you could understand why. So if you happen to see any of them outside, please do not go over to them and start talking to them or asking them anything. They're not allowed to speak to you.

Now you have a very important job, so please dress appropriately. I ask the men to wear a tie, if you have one, and I ask the women to dress as you would for an important job.

Now, we are going to recess the trial until tomorrow morning. The court officer is going to take you to the jury room to show you where it is you report. And make sure we have reliable contact information for you. So make sure you give her an accurate phone number for where you could be reached in case there's any problem.

Please make special effort to be here on time. The earlier we get started tomorrow, the earlier we finish. Okay. Have a very nice afternoon. I just ask the court officer to take the jury to the jury room.

Ms. Chu, you'll give her the information

of my client's indigency, if I could, may I

just copy the one committed to the U.S. Supreme

24

Court?

THE COURT: The answer, even though

Mr. Dranove is retained, I feel it's very
important that the defense get daily copy in
this case. So I am authorizing daily copy on
the condition that I get an affirmation from
the defense attorney before the trial is over
establishing the indigency of the defendant and
his inability to pay for daily copy.

MR. DRANOVE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: The form of that will work out between us.

MR. DRANOVE: With respect to tomorrow, how many witnesses and which witnesses should I hopefully know in advance so I can prepare.

THE COURT: I ask Miss Chu to provide, off the record, who anticipate who she will call and try to do that on a daily basis so you can be prepared.

We are in recess until tomorrow morning.

Be here very punctually tomorrow morning.

10:30.

MR. DRANOVE: With respect to the matter, if I submit a proposed order for a particular private investigator, reasonable hourly rate,

```
Jury Selection
                                                                  132
           would your Honor consider signing that?
1
                THE COURT: I'll consider it. Sure.
2
 3
                MR. DRANOVE: Thank you.
 4
                (Adjourned to May 6, 2009)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

THE COURT: For the record, I want to put two things on the record before the jurors come out.

The first is that there was a scheduling issue regarding one of the jurors yesterday who was picked, who informed everyone he had a job interview scheduled for this afternoon at 2:30. I had asked him to try to make an arrangement to switch the job interview to a later time or to another day. And I got permission of counsel to work with the juror regarding this issue.

Me that he had rescheduled the interview until four o'clock this afternoon today. I indicated it might work out since the parties didn't know about it, we might have a lot of witnesses scheduled for today. And I asked for permission to try to reschedule for later in the week, which he gave me. So I called his potential employer, and they were kind enough to reschedule the interview without any prejudice to him until Friday afternoon at four o'clock. And I called him back to tell him that, and he said that was fine with him too.

I want to alert everyone that we are going to need to break the trial earlier on Friday in order that he can accommodate that job interview. Hopefully that will work out for everyone.

Now, the second thing I want to put on the record is that yesterday the DA made an application to read part of the transcript of the defendant's testimony from the prior trial, and I asked defense counsel to let me know if he has any objection to that.

I received a fax this morning indicating that the Defense was requesting a larger portion of the transcript be read back. Since I just got it, I want a chance just to review it. I'll have my decision tomorrow morning. I don't think this has to be resolved right now. So I will take a look at it, read it carefully and have a decision by tomorrow morning as to the extent of the transcript that needs to be read back.

Are the People ready to proceed?

MS. CHU: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you ready to proceed, Mr.

Dranove.

4

MR. DRANOVE: I am. 1 I have inquiry of The Court, if I may? 2 THE COURT: Yes. 3 MR. DRANOVE: I have a new fax machine I 4 5 am using, started using it yesterday. I faxed over a letter this morning addressing the 6 request for assignment of an investigator. 7 don't know whether your office received --8 THE COURT: Yes, I did. I am sorry, I 9 10 should have mentioned I received that also. MR. DRANOVE: You will have a decision 11 12 sometime as soon as possible. 13 One pick person I could not track down so far from the phone number information --14 THE COURT: I will have an answer. I will 15 grant the application, but it's conditional, 16 17 again, by me receiving an appropriate 18 affirmation as to the indigency and the 19 inability to afford hiring such an 20 investigator. 21 MR. DRANOVE: Judge, may I present that to 22 you Monday? THE COURT: Yes. 23 24 MR. DRANOVE: Thank you, sir. 25 We are ready to proceed.

5

THE COURT: Give me an order. 1 MR. DRANOVE: I understand. I appreciate 2 your accepting this in letter application. 3 THE COURT: Right. I'm granting the 4 5 application. THE COURT: Tell James to bring out the 6 7 jury that is present. MS. CHU: As well as defendant's 8 9 testimony. If we could resolve the issue having to do with what exactly you're going to 10 allow in. She won't be testifying in the 11 12 afternoon, so if you wanted to address that when we break for the lunch, we can do that at 13 14 that time. 15 THE COURT: You're talking about the 16 defendant's prior testimony? MR. DRANOVE: That could be read in by the 17 court, any court reporter or the prosecution. 18 Once we reach a decision. 19 MS. CHU: You have to decide what parts 20 21 are going --THE COURT: I don't think a witness is 22 23 going to testify about that. MS. CHU: She is actually the reporter 24 25 that took --

6

1 THE COURT: Is there objection on the accuracy of what is read back? 2 MR. DRANOVE: Correct. 3 MS. CHU: When she testifies, I will do it 4 5 while she is up there. THE COURT: You don't need --6 MS. CHU: I don't need -- while she was --7 THE COURT: If I can. 8 MS. CHU: She is not going to testify this 9 10 morning. At some time before she testifies, if 11 she itemize exactly what it is that we are 12 going to read from his testimony --13 THE COURT: I am going to make it clear. She don't have to read it back. It doesn't 14 have to be read back this afternoon. 15 MR. DRANOVE: One more thing. 16 THE COURT: I'm finished. 17 MR. DRANOVE: I had 9:45 a.m. settlement 18 conference in a federal action in Manhattan. 19 It concerns a gentleman who is 23, locked up, 20 seeking to get documents. Started as a civil 21 22 litigant. Ultimately this federal litigation, the litigation to force documents to be 23 produced. I think it's resolved. I won't know 24 for sure until the Attorney General's office

and I meet with the judge. I'm scheduled for 9:45 in the morning.

I could call and explain I'm engaged in trial. I can't get an adjourn -- I can't guarantee I will get an adjournment, so -- I think I'll call later today. From what I understand, I believe today's testimony won't last until five o'clock. I think I can reach Judge McMann's chambers at a reasonable hour.

THE COURT: See what you can do. The ADA has a lot of witnesses she has lined up for tomorrow. See what you can do. If you need my help, let me know.

COURT OFFICER: Ready for the jury?

THE COURT: Yes.

COURT OFFICER: Jury entering.

COURT CLERK: Jurors are present with the exception of juror number 6, Marlon Antigua.

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I want to thank you for being so punctual. I want to commend you for being the best looking jury in Brooklyn today.

Now, we are missing one juror, and so we can't really start until that juror arrives.

We haven't heard anything from this juror, so I

am hoping the juror will arrive shortly. Let's just wait a few minutes.

You can talk, if you want, in the jury box while we are waiting. We are ready to proceed and hopefully the juror will arrive shortly.

(pause)

COURT CLERK: Jurors are now present and seated.

THE COURT: Again, I wish everyone a good morning. Good morning, Mr. Antigua.

Now, when we left off yesterday, you were selected, you, the jury, in this case, and what I want to do right now is to go over with you the procedures that we will follow for the rest of this trial so that you can understand exactly what will happen, and also I want to go over with you exactly what your responsibilities will be. Now that you're the jurors in this case.

So let's start with the procedure for the trial. The next step in this trial will be an opening statement by the District Attorney, Miss Chu.

The law requires that the district attorney make an opening statement, telling you

Opening - Court

2.

what she intends to prove by way of evidence in this case.

After you hear her opening statements, Mr. Dranove, the Defense attorney gets a chance to make an opening statement. But he is under no obligation to make an opening statement. It's entirely optional for the defense attorney.

After you've heard the opening statement or statements, the district attorney will then begin presenting her case to you. She is going to call witnesses to the witness stand, and she will get a chance to question each of her witnesses first. We call the district attorney's questioning of each prosecution witness direct examination.

After the direct examination is completed, defense counsel gets a chance to question each witness, and, of course, we call that cross-examination.

Once the district attorney has finished presenting her witnesses and her evidence to you, the defendant gets a chance to call witnesses and present evidence also. But is under no obligation to call anyone as a witness or present any evidence. It is entirely

optional for the defense.

After you've heard all of the evidence, the attorneys get one more chance to stand before you to make a closing argument, which we call a summation.

And then after you've heard each of their summations, I have to give you specific instructions on the law that you must apply to decide the case.

I will then give you the case for your deliberations, and a verdict of either guilty or not guilty for each charge I will list for you on a verdict sheet. It's a piece of paper, it will have the charges on it.

Once you have all agreed as to what the right verdict should be for each charge on that verdict sheet, you will check it off under guilty or not guilty. Once you completed filling out the verdict sheet, I'll ask you to send me a note and tell me that you have arrived at a unanimous verdict.

I will then ask you to come in the courtroom and announce that verdict through your foreperson, through our foreman, who will be juror number 1. That is the outline for the

trial.

For the most part, evidence comes through the witnesses who testify at trial. There may also be physical exhibits, which I'll allow you to see, and if these attorneys agree on any facts about which there is no dispute, they will stipulate that they agree on those facts and you may consider them evidence also.

Please remember that the questions the attorneys ask during the questioning are not evidence. It is the answers the witnesses give to the attorney's questions that will be evidence.

For example, if an attorney asks a witness, do you own an automobile, and the witness answers, no. You must not assume the witness owns an automobile because the attorney asked a question about one. You have to listen to the answer, because together with the question, that is what the evidence will be.

You may hear the attorneys make objections during the trial. The law allows an attorney to object to a question asked by the other side or to an answer given by a witness. And you'll hear the attorneys say objection. They may

2.2

even give a reason for the objection. It's my job to rule on each objection, and I will. If I agree with the attorney, I will say sustained. That means I believe the question or the answer is not legally proper, and you must disregard it. If I disagree with the attorney, I am going to say overruled. That means I believe the question and the answer is legally proper, and you may consider it.

Please don't hold it against these attorneys if they make objections that I rule against. They're just doing their job.

Now, let's go over your responsibilities. You've been selected to decide what happened in this case. You will decide whether you believe a witness or you don't, what weight you will give any of the witness' testimony, you will decide what the verdict should be in this case. So we call you the judges of the facts.

My job is to be judge of the law. The attorneys have to follow the law whether they agree with it or not as I give it to them and so must you.

I don't have any power to interfere with your power. As the judge of the facts. And I

2.2

am very happy to have you here to decide this case. But, please, don't interfere with my power when I tell you something isn't the law, that's it, you have to follow it whether you agree with it or not.

Now, because you will decide this case, it is extremely important that you keep an open mind, not form or express any opinion about this case to anyone. When we take a break in the trial, when you go home in the evening, when you're with the other jurors in the jury room during a break, you are not allowed to decide the facts of the case or express any opinion about the case.

Now, I encourage you to make this as pleasant a social experience as possible, so when you are together in the jury room, if you want to talk to each other, please feel free to do so. If you want to talk about the beautiful view from the jury room, if you want to talk about the weather, what is on sale at Macy's, whatever interest you have, by all means, talk to each other. But not about the case. You have to wait until the end of the trial when your deliberations begin to talk about the

Opening - Court

case.

Now, we have specific rules you must follow:

You're not allowed to go out to the scene where this crime is alleged to have occurred to look at it. You have to decide the case solely on the evidence. Should this case be reported in the media, you are not allowed to read or listen to any accounts of it, and if you become aware of an attempt by anyone to improperly influence you or any other members of the jury, you must promptly report that to one of our court officers and we will take immediate corrective action.

Now, let me go over with you a couple of other things that are very important for you to know. You may have seen trials on television or in the movies, and they show jurors sitting in a jury box with pads and pencils and the jurors are taking notes while the witnesses are testifying. Here in New York, we do not believe that in most cases jurors should try to take notes. Why? Well, first of all, this is not going to be that long of a trial.

Secondly, you are not chosen for your

note-taking abilities. It's very hard to try to write down accurately what witnesses are saying and hear everything. And, third, and most importantly, we have a court reporter who will be taking down everything as accurately as possible during this trial. So if during your deliberations you do have some question amongst yourselves about what a witness said, you can simply ask to have the testimony read back to you with complete assurance that that is what the witness said. So I don't want you to try to take notes. I want you to sit back and listen.

If at any time you don't hear something, don't be ashame to let me know. All you have to do is raise your hand in the jury box, that's a signal to me to have the witness repeat the answer for you or I'll have the court reporter read back what the witness just said.

Now, another thing that is very important for you to understand is that this is not the only case I have to handle. Sometimes I have other matters that they assign me. I wish I only had one case at a time, my life would be a

2.

2.3

lot easier. It doesn't work that way. I will always excuse you when I do other business.

I think it is very inconsiderate for a judge to keep jurors waiting around while a judge does other business.

Try to be very punctual. If you didn't figure it out already, I am going to tell you right now, when I give you a time that we are going to work on the trial, that is the time I would like everyone to be here. Sometimes we do have to wait for a witness, that is beyond anyone's control. But other than that, we should proceed as punctually as possible, and I do appreciate your cooperation.

The other thing I want to mention to you is that we are now living in the world of the internet. Use of the computer has become very common. I want to instruct you right now that you must resist any temptation to try to go on the internet to try to find out any information about the case or any of the people involved in this case. You can't do that. I am sure you could understand that there is a lot of miscellaneous information and inaccurate information out there, and you have to decide

this case solely on the evidence in this courtroom. So, please, if you have a computer, you use the internet, do not try to find out any information about this case during this trial on-line. I appreciate your cooperation. That completes what I have to tell you.

We are now ready to move into the next step in this trial, which will be the opening statement by Miss Chu.

You may proceed when you're ready.

MS. CHU: Thank you.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen:

It was just suppose to be another Saturday night hanging out with his friends. That is what Edgar Ojeda had planned for that Saturday night, February 26, 2005.

They began their day earlier that Saturday morning going shopping right here in downtown Brooklyn. And they spent the day together, and after going home until around the evening time, they arranged to meet up again so they can go hang out that night.

Now, they ended up at a bar called El Borinquen Bar. It was located at 314 39

Street, here in the Sunset Park section of

Brooklyn, and they ended up there after trying to go to a party out in Fort Greene. They couldn't find parking, then they stopped by a strip club over on Third Avenue. Then they ended up at this bar.

What you will learn about El Borinquen
Bar, it's a local bar. A local bar on 39 and
Third. It's been owned by a lot of people,
Amnesta Bar, and now known as El Borinquen Bar.
A bar that is not too big. It's right there on
the corner, right on 39 and Third. If you know
the overpass of the BQE, it's right under there
diagonally across is the Costco.

What you will learn, it's a narrow bar.

It's an entrance on 39 Street. There is also a side entrance on Third Avenue. As you walk into the bar, it's narrow and it has a bar that runs the length of the bar, about halfway down on the left-hand side. There are some tables and chairs set up on the right-hand side, right by where this side entrance is. Side exit is.

There's also a jukebox over there. About halfway into the bar towards the back, there is a dance floor on the right-hand side, then there are rest rooms in the back, far back left

corner.

Now, when Edgar and his friends, it's
Carlos Solomon, Marcus Carrasquillo and
Jonathan Dominguez, when they arrived at this
bar, it's now after midnight. So, technically,
it's the next day, February 27, 2005, little
bit after one o'clock. And they get some
beers, and Edgar and Carlos kind of set up near
where the jukebox is. Standing where that side
entrance is.

What you'll all learn, the two guys, they were with Marcus and Jonathan, they know some people at the bar. So they're kind of hanging out by the bar area conversing with them. And about half hour into them being at this bar, the defendant, that man there, Enrique Rivera, walks up to Edgar Ojeda, while standing by this door, and says something, kind of leans in and says something to him. And Carlos, who's standing next to him, can't hear, but he sees Edgar responds and says something. Next thing that happens, they see that the defendant either push or punch Edgar somewhere in this area (indicating). The body area. Then Carlos goes to try to protect Edgar, but Carlos is a

a

lot taller than Edgar. Edgar is fairly -- is five foot six, and Carlos is six foot two. He goes to try to protect Edgar, tries to go after the defendant and some of the people that he's with. In the process of doing that, they run out, he gets alerted, and at that point Edgar realizes that the defendant didn't punch or push him. What he did, he had stabbed him. And Edgar takes off his scarf and blood begins to pour out of him. He says, "I think I got stabbed. He's alerting his friend, Carlos and Jonathan and Marcus. What they do when they realize, indeed, their friend, Edgar, is stabbed, they turn -- their attentions are now on him and they try to get him out of the bar.

What you'll learn, they try and control the bleeding, they try to take him out of bar. Their car is right on Third Avenue, right underneath the underpass on the other side of Third Avenue facing towards the higher numbers. So they try to walk him out there, take him over there to the car and they tried to rush him over to Lutheran Medical Center, which is about 20 blocks away on 58 Street.

And you'll learn while they're there,

they're trying to tell Edgar to hold on, they are trying to prevent the bleeding from happening or keep going. When they arrived at the hospital, they bring him right in. Carlos picked him up, they arrived at the hospital about two o'clock, that is the time they admit him into the hospital. And unfortunately the personnel at Lutheran Medical Center are unable to do anything for Edgar and he's pronounced dead at 2:22 in the morning on February 27, 2005. At the hands of that man, (indicating) Enrique Rivera.

Now, you will learn, based upon the fact that Edgar had come to the hospital and expired their, the police get notified. Because Carlos and the -- frantic Carlos, Marcus and Jonathan, they're frantic -- I am sorry -- attempts to bring Edgar to the hospital, they are not thinking about calling 911. They just take him to the hospital. So the hospital personnel actually called. And they confirmed that someone was injured there, and Carlos, Marcus and Jonathan, they remain at the hospital.

And what you will learn, there was an officer from the 72 Precinct, person by the

 22α

name of Justin Harriman, he's assigned to respond to the hospital, and he sees Marcus, Jonathan and Carlos there and he talks to them and he confirmed that, yes, indeed, there was someone that was injured and killed.

They find out where the location is. They have an officer arrive at the bar, but by the time the officer gets there, the bar's been closed. You see fresh water in front of it cleaned up. So they have someone sit there at the location, the El Borinquen Bar and preserve it as best they can. They set up a crime scene tape.

You will learn there was police officers that was assigned to sit on the location to make sure that no one comes in and out or goes inside. In the meantime, they are trying to get a hold of the bar owner so that they can get inside.

But in the meantime, one of the police officers that gets assigned from the Crime Scene Unit is the Detective Michael Cunningham, and he gets assigned to process the scene and when he gets to the bar, the bar is still closed. It's about 4:40 in the morning. When

he gets there, when he does, he tries to process as best he can. He can't get inside.

What he does, he takes photographs of the outside of the location on 39 and Third. He takes the Third Avenue view, he takes from the 39th view. He takes it from across street. He takes measurements from inside. While he's there, he notices that sidewalk looks like it's been washed. It's actually fresh blood at the corner of 39th and Third. Drops of blood on the corner. He takes photographs of that. He takes samples. How he takes samples, he'll explain to you. You get a Q-tip, he swabs the area, he puts it all in a package, he wrapped it up and he then sends that off for testing in the DNA lab.

Now, in the meantime, Detective John

Darino from the 72 Precinct, he is assigned

this case. And he too speaks with Marcus,

Jonathan and Carlos about what had transpired.

And in the course of speaking to them, they

learn about some other people and they want to

talk to people that were at the bar. And in

the course of their investigation, they learn

that the defendant, his brother and two other

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of his friends were at this location, and they begin to look for the defendant.

What you will learn is that on February 28, the next day, about one in the morning, Detective James Gaynor, who's working with the Detective Darino, goes to the defendant's parents' house at 30 Bush Street and he goes there. When Detective Gaynor goes there, he actually knows he has some information regarding whatever the defendant's clothing was at the time of this incident. Camouflage jacket. Hoodie sweatshirt. He knows what the description is. So he gets into the location because the defendant's mother opens the door for him. While he's inside, he observed a pile of clothes, camouflage jacket, in a pile inside the location. And true, the use of an interpreter, a detective, a Spanish speaking detective, from the precinct, he is able to communicate with the defendant's mother. And he recovers and vouchers that clothing that he finds at 30 Bush Street.

Now, at about 4:20 that same morning, February 28, 2005, Detective Darino, and his team of investigators, find the defendant in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

25**a**

Queens. And they bring him back to the 72 Precinct, and he put him in an interview room.

Now, once the defendant arrived back at the precinct, you will learn he was brought into the interview room and he was spoken to by Detective Darino and Detective Gaynor, but before they speak to him, they read what you all know as Miranda rights.

After the defendant hears his Miranda rights, he agrees to speak with them. And what he tells the detective is that he was at that bar that night, and sometime while he was there he and the victim kept staring at each other. And sometime by the end of the night, he ends up by the bar and Mr. Ojeda was still giving him looks. And asked the defendant what's up. And the defendant says -- at that point he says, what seems to be your problem, to the victim. And he said at that point, he terms the phrase, he says, "the crowd rose." And he felt punches and grabbing, so he took out a knife and he used it in self-defense. after he made his statement, the detectives go, all right, well, would you like to put that down on paper? So they give him a pen and

paper, and he writes down pretty much the same thing that he had just told them orally.

Once he's done writing out this statement, you'll learn that he was asked whether he wanted to speak with the District Attorney's office. And he says, yes. And so what happens after that is around 10:30 in the morning that same day. February 28, 2005, an assistant district attorney by the name of Jennifer Sipress comes into the precinct and speaks to the defendant.

It's common procedure in the District
Attorney's office that when you speak to a
defendant that it is recorded. It is recorded,
video taped. It's video taped. And that is
what's done with the defendant. And you'll
actually get to see that video tape of the
defendant. And, again, he is read his rights
by ADA Jennifer Sipress, and what he says this
time is that while he's inside the bar now the
victim bumps him. And when the victim bumps
him, they keep giving each other eyes, and when
the defendant goes up to the bar, he asks the
victim what is his problem and then he feels
someone hit him from his side. And the victim

was still in front of him, so he says he then takes his pocket knife out and he swings it around and then he ran immediately out of the location. And he ditches the knife somewhere, got into his car and he drove off.

Now, after this statement is done and you'll get to see that statement, you'll learn that the defendant was put in a line-up. He was put in line-ups. And when he was put line-ups, he was identified by Carlos Solomon, as well as a bouncer at the bar that was there as a patron that night. As being the person that they saw punching or pushing Edgar Ojeda just prior to him realizing that he had been stabbed.

Now, after Lutheran Medical Center was unable to save Mr. Ojeda's life, his body was then taken to the Medical Examiner's office here in Kings County. And there was an autopsy that was conducted by a Dr. Frederic. You're going to hear from her as well. What she found upon her autopsy of Mr. Ojeda's body is that he sustained three stab wounds to his body. He received one in the left, upper chest. This stab wound cut through the skin, goes between

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28**a**

the area of the ribs, cuts through a rib and punctures his left lung. The knife wound is actually five inches deep, that means the knife went in five inches. In the process of going in five inches into his body, it goes and punctures his lung about one and a quarter inch. So that causes his lung to bleed. There were two other stab wounds to him. On his back, left. Those two stab wounds, two and three quarter inches low, and the other one is two inches deep on the back. And what she is going to tell you is that all of those stab wounds have what she called acute angle on either side, which means that the object, or the knife, was sharp on both ends. They all match having the same pattern. And it's clearly created by some sort of weapon. It could be a puncture by someone using that hand to poke a hole into someone's body like that (indicating).

Now, with those wounds, basically Ojeda bled to death. His lungs made out of blood, and it just bleeds out and that is why they were unable to save his life when he gets to the hospital.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, in the meantime, the clothing that was found at 30 Bush Street, which the defendant at a later proceeding admits that he was wearing that night, gets sent to the medical examiner's office, forensic biology department, which is the DNA lab.

What happens is, there is a person by the name of Linda Razzano, she is a criminis there, she looks at this bleeding. There is a jacket, there is a hoodie, there are pants and there is also a hat. And what she finds that's on this hat that was worn by the defendant that night, there are two stains of blood. Two stains of blood on the front and on the back. And she tests that hat, and not only do they show blood stains from the front and back of the defendant's hat belong to Edgar Ojeda, but all of the samples that were taken by Detective Sullivan -- Detective Cunningham -- I am sorry -- there was another detective that gets there and gets to go inside, and he finds three other samples of blood from that side exit where Mr. Ojeda and his friend Carlos were standing. Three blood samples that gets there. So that three blood samples, in addition to the

one Cunningham found outside on the street corner, in addition to the two stains that are on the defendant's hat belonged to Edgar Ojeda.

Now, you're going to hear from Mr. Ojeda's friends. You're going to hear from Marcus.

You're going to hear from Carlos. You're going to hear from Jonathan. You're going hear from the bouncer, whose name is Enrique Navarette, who was present at the bar that night and saw what happened. You're going hear from the police officers that responds. You're going to hear from Detective Darino, who takes statements from the defendant, and you're going to hear from the ADA, as well as the DNA expert, and Dr. Frederic.

And after you hear all of the evidence in this case, I am going to come back, and I am going to speak with you like I am speaking with you now. I am going to show you how the evidence in this case will have proven that the defendant, Enrigue Rivera, is guilty of causing the death of Edgar Ojeda on February 27, 2005.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Dr. Dranove, do you wish to make an opening statement?

Opening - Dranove/Defense

MR. DRANOVE: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then you may proceed when you're ready.

MR. DRANOVE: Thank you.

MR. DRANOVE: Good morning: I am Joel Dranove, I represent Mr. Rivera.

I listened, as did you, very carefully to the opening statement, and I wish to give you my opening statement telling you what else you will hear that is critical. That you need to understand that there was a rush, by Detective Darino on his first homicide case, to arrest someone real fast and he did. And the fact that you will hear my client's statement is totally inconsistent with the injuries. The eyewitness observations are totally inconsistent with the injury.

Those facts known to Detective Darino has nothing to do with what he did. It was his first case several years ago as a homicide investigator. He was able to question my client when he awoke from sleeping in the middle of the night in a precinct at five in the morning. In that precinct was my client's brother, my client was -- well, a victim of --

31a

you will find psychological manipulation by the detective. Whatever the detective said to my client and my client said to the detective before the video tape was never recorded.

And you'll hear there was a recording device in the precinct. It was not used. They chose not to record what they said to my client.

You will hear that after my client made his statement, his brother was released. They got -- do they get the right person? Didn't matter, Detective Darino wrote, "case closed" that morning on his folder. "Case closed."

You will hear that the detective was so convincing that he convinced himself of certain things that he knew were false and yet he put them into police reports knowing they were false. And they're very important. Because he put them into the document that brought my client into court. The complaint. He said he was --

MS. CHU: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. DRANOVE: That witnesses saw my client strike Edgar Ojeda repeatedly about the chest

Opening - Dranove/Defense

Q

and the back with a closed fist. That is not true. Noone saw my client strike Mr. Ojeda, the victim, on this tragic incident on the back. Noone. In fact, Mr. Solomon will say this case is a few years old, we have some idea people will say --

MS. CHU: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. DRANOVE: Punch with a closed fist one time, his friend Mr. Ojeda and run away. That's what Mr. Solomon will say. And he will say he ran after my client, and he got to the door of the door, my client left and bouncer prevented him from going after my client. And when he was there, the bouncer was preventing him from going after my client, whatever was going on behind him was going on. There was screaming, a commotion and it continued for a long time. Mr. Solomon never saw my client with a knife in his hand. He said what he saw. Closed fist.

Now, this is an interesting bar because it actually takes security seriously. Whoever went as a patron is searched. You'll hear testimony about that. Careful search. They

Opening - Dranove/Defense

Q

don't have weapons. But it's a bar. This is a bar. Bar employees and knives. You won't hear from the bartenders. I don't think the prosecution is going to call any on-duty bouncer. I think Mr. Navarette was off duty and just there that night.

Now, Mr. Solomon came back to his friend, and at some time observed blood coming from Mr. Ojeda. There was a commotion, there was a tremendous amount of commotion going on and my client wasn't there. Something was going on between people, not including my client, and it included stabbing the victim and his death.

Detective Darino also said that the witness, the friends of Mr. Ojeda, saw him bleeding from his chest and neck and back, not true. It's under oath. That was true according to the detective. The detective also said that --

MS. CHU: Objection, your Honor. This is --

THE COURT: Overruled. That is what he says the evidence will show.

MS. CHU: That is not what he said.

THE COURT: That is what he is saying the

evidence will show.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DRANOVE: Deponent states he further informed by the defendant's own word that the defendant pulled out a knife and swung the knife at the victim. My client never said he swung a knife at the victim. He never said that. He never said, I swung the knife at the victim. That is in the complaint signed by Detective Darino immediately beneath the words false statements made in this document are punishable as a Class A misdemeanor, pursuant to Section 210.45 of the Penal Law. I believe you'll find he made false statements. I believe you'll find they are punishable under Penal Law. I believe you'll find he wasn't punished. And then he was convinced this case is closed and never went further. And the report he submitted and he signed, known as a complaint follow-up.

He wrote on February 28, 2005, at approximately 5:15, Enrigue Rivera, after being advised of his rights, made an admission to stabbing the victim in this case. Mr. Rivera never made an admission to stabbing anybody in this case. Now, that is a series of false

statements by the detective in his zeal to close the case. He closed it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You'll find also from the witnesses, the prosecution mentioned Miss Razzano -- I mean Mrs. Razzano in particular something very interesting. The DNA expert in an official report requested permission to compare the DNA found in the hat of somebody they will say is my client, with the DNA of the second person whose blood was found in and on the hat. was DNA from two people in the blood spot on the hat that's going to show up in the charts that the witness will show you. A second person's blood is in the blood spot where Mr. Ojeda's blood. It's going to come out during the trial. It's going to come out during the trial my client had no injuries. This is an open question, four years old now, whose blood is it? The DNA expert said, get me a sample. Either the prosecution did or did not. We don't know. And why not, I don't know. But the question is, who else was bleeding there and why? Was it someone with a knife, his hand slid on the blade? We'll never know. Was that somebody injured whoever blood

was injured in addition to Mr. Ojeda who passed away.

The detective has, and you will see, had an opportunity to talk to my client. He sees him. My client's supposedly has made a confession or a statement whatever enough for the detective to close the case, and he asked my client where is the knife? Rather important question. My client says, I threw it away. What did you do? Where'd you throw it? Nope. Even the detective doesn't believe that's so. He don't even ask him where is the knife. But the case was closed. It's unfortunate it was closed before the investigation was completed. But by stating, case close, the investigation was brought to a close.

Why was the bar cleaned up? I don't think anyone's going to testify to that.

In the bar there was a long period of a five between persons unknown except but for Carlos Solomon, one or two of his friends and the at some time at the end of this, Mr. Ojeda says, I am bleeding, get me to the hospital.

Mr. Ojeda doesn't say any one in particular, guy in the camouflage, or the guy with the cap,

38a

Opening - Dranove/Defense or the guy with the hoodie, nothing like that is said by him. He just said, I'm bleeding. My client also, on that Saturday night, thought it was just another Saturday night. He went with one brother and some friends. To a local bar. And his life was changed forever. Many years ago, he plead not guilty. I believe you'll find that so. Thank you very much. (The rest of this page is blank, followed by the first witness' testimony, P.O. Lopiccolo.)